FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-166-S
Tuesday
29 August 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-166-S *29 August 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: The Daily Report is publishing the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies. Additional supplements will be issued as translated material becomes available.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

Congress Proceedings Continue 9 Jun *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 1

Congress Proceedings Continue 9 Jun

PM1406123189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 3-9

["USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Stenographic Record."—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text]

Thirteenth Session

9 June 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1000.

Comrade A. I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, presiding.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies, let us continue the congress's work. Let us continue discussing questions pertaining to the basic guidelines for the USSR's domestic and foreign policy and the program for the forthcoming activities of the USSR Government.

The floor is granted to Deputy Beyshekeyeva. Comrade Popov, Moscow, will be next.

Z. Beyshekeyeva, senior shepherd at the Dzhety-Oguz Special State Farm, Dzhety-Oguz, Issyk-Kul Oblast, Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] (from the CPSU): Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies! Restructuring is the only correct path for the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society. That is why it is supported by the people. Each of us is experiencing the first visible results. Step by step our state's foreign policy is reaching more and more new frontiers. We learned with satisfaction of the results of Comrade Gorbachev's visit to China, with which Kirghiziya has a more than 800-km border.

Noticeable changes that are taking place in the countryside are evident to me, a woman shepherd. Thanks to the introduction of the new economic mechanism, output has shown a tendency to increase. The most important thing is that we are becoming genuine proprietors of the land.

However, it would be wrong to close our eyes to the difficulties and problems that exist. The working and living conditions of livestock workers seriously worry us. This is especially noticeable in sheep raising, the leading branch of our republic's economy. You know how hard the work of a livestock worker, especially a shepherd, is. Almost year-around nomadic life at an altitude of more than 3,000 meters with a drastically continental climate, unsettled conditions, separation from family and cultural life, and work without vacations, days off, or holidays. There is no mechanization. Thanks to our forefathers for inventing pitchforks. They are our chief "mechanization." This negatively affects the prestige of our occupation, and young people are not going to work in sheep raising and animal husbandry.

It would seem that in such a situation we should receive especially sensitive attention, but that is not happening. Industry has not yet organized the production of all-weather mobile shepherd's homes, tents, and high-quality work clothes; the automatic supply of electric power has not been arranged; and the wage coefficients for livestock workers working in high mountain areas have not been revised. Shepherds are demanding that a year's work be counted as 18 months', as it is for border guards. We, who live alongside them, are in worse conditions, yet the benefits are not extended to us. I believe that the pension age should be set at 50 years for us shepherds, too.

These questions pertain equally to all regions of the country where sheep raising is developed. They were repeatedly raised before the former USSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers. But the ministries and departments concerned continue to remain deaf to our justifiable requests and complaints. Therefore, if the country needs wool, these problems, esteemed deputies, esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, must be tackled.

I also appeal to you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, because you worked in Stavropol Kray and know what the shepherd's work is like.

Comrades! Kirghiziya is one of the main suppliers of fine wool and mutton in the country. At present more than 63 percent of our total volume of washed wool is shipped out of the republic, some for export. We earn only about R230,000 million from its sale. Calculations show that if it were processed locally the republic could receive a real income of four to five times as much.

A high-quality suit that takes about 1 kg of wool to make now costs around R200, yet we sell 1 kg of wool for R8-10. And if you consider how much prices have been raised for farm machinery, spare parts, feed, building materials, and other manufactured goods, it works out that our collective farms [kolkhozes] and state farms [sovkhozes] and we shepherds are working for practically nothing.

In the course of numerous preelection meetings, my constituents and colleagues gave me a directive—to put before the government the question of revising procurement prices for agricultural products, especially wool and meat. We ask you, Nikolay Ivanovich, to take this into account in the work of the newly formed government.

In recent years the ecological situation surrounding Lake Issyk-Kul, a unique gift of nature that is an all-union cultural resort, has been deteriorating. The uncontrolled withdrawal of water for irrigation from the rivers feeding it is resulting in a lowering of the lake's level. The unregulated construction of vacation establishments without treatment installations, and many other factors are creating a real danger that the sad fate of the Aral will be repeated. The republic itself will not solve this problem. Today it is necessary to establish an all-union coordinating agency and draw up recommendations on Issyk-Kul's problems. This is all the more important in that, in my view, Lake Issyk-Kul can become a major tourism and vacation center for Soviet people.

Comrades! We are all witnesses of how democratization and glasnost have provided a powerful stimulus for the growth of national consciousness. That, of course, is good. The representatives of 80 nations and nationalities live and work in our mountainous region, Issyk-Kul Oblast. We have had no internationality frictions in the form in which they are manifesting themselves in other regions of the country. But we are concerned over the fact that certain groups of people are creating tension in internationality relations in the country. This has been clear at this congress, among other places.

In any situation one must remember that our strength lies in cohesiveness and unity, in the consolidation of all nations and nationalities. The mass news media should be oriented toward this, too. People are tired of reading all sorts of negative reports and disinformation. They expect articles and television programs that objectively disclose ways to solve the problems that have accumulated in internationality relations, and elucidations of the key issues in internationality policy.

And we, the people's chosen representatives, should use all of our powers to promote the stabilization of the situation and the strengthening of Leninist internationality friendship among Soviet peoples. Thank you for the attention. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is granted to Comrade Gavril Kharitonovich Popov. Comrade Yakubov, Uzbekistan, will be next.

G.Kh. Popov, chief editor of the journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI, Moscow City (from the USSR Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies): Comrade deputies. I would like to dwell on the platform set forth in the government's report. My task has been made much easier by the fact that we have already elected Nikolay Ivanovich, and, correspondingly, my remarks on the platform will not be personal. I was very worried that yesterday might have seen the emergence of the effect which we saw at the elections. I would call it the "peripheral effect" [effekt kraynego]—this was when a considerable group of our local leaders to all intents and purposes had to answer to voters at the elections for issues which they were essentially unable to resolve: answers for empty shelves, for unresolved housing questions, for the slow progress of restructuring, and for much else besides. Though they were "peripheral," they had to answer for all this personally. I was very worried that this might happen here, too. Moreover, I would like to say that we must also take account of the fact that we have a special kind of government. I remember I attended a Council of Ministers session 15 years ago chaired by Aleksey Nikolayevich Kosygin. I was struck then by the fact that Aleksey Nikolayevich became heated and spoke vigorously for almost an hour, yet during this time two ministers coolly remained seated. Only later did I realize that Aleksey Nikolayevich was addressing ministers whom he had not appointed, whom he had not chosen, and, above all, whom he knew for certain he could not remove.

Now the head of government has already been elected and, it seems to me, we can calmly discuss government problems and the platform as a platform. There are two aspects to this platform. The aspect linked with urgent tasks for the next 1-2 years, and the whole program.

I will discuss the urgent tasks first. The question of the financial crisis and the improvement of it is at the forefront. How do I see this question? If I am R1,000 in debt, I must make a list and see whom I own money to. I think roughly the same about our deficit. If it is R100 billion, there should be a table stating under what specific headings this R100 billion debt came about. I must say that over the past year, when there have been discussions about this deficit, I have still not seen such a table. But if there is no analysis, it is very hard to think about a cure.

The report attempted to show how the deficit came about. It stated in particular that an additional R21 billion was spent on social programs over the past 4 years. Last year R14.5 billion went on wages, and R8 billion on Chernobyl. These, of course, are specific figures, but they relate to different timeframes. One figure covers 4 years, the second covers 1 year, and the third figure is a one-shot figure, but, nonetheless, they do provide some kind of guide and make it possible to assess the situation. What is the upshot? Look, spending on agriculture went R10 billion over, it cannot be reduced. The report said that we should increase it. Spending on social needs was exceeded, it cannot be reduced, the report said that it should be increased.

Spending on Afghanistan, too, will clearly not decrease, since, on the one hand, we have to pay the people of this country for not listening to Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov and listening too much to our generals. (Applause). And on the other hand, we should nonetheless really pay all war veterans so we do not feel ashamed to look them in the eye. Furthermore, it seems to me that it will not be possible to make savings on Chernobyl, because in its wake a great deal more money will have to be invested in the Ukraine and Belorussia. And, above all, we will have to develop a safety system for stations and pipelines to prevent any repetition of the Chernobyl effect. In general it turns out that new spending is needed everywhere. How then can we eliminate our difficulties?

Nikolay Petrovich Shmelev has already said here yesterday that the cooperative system has not created any particular problems with regard to the deficit and that it is essentially a patch covering 2 percent of the hole.

I want to dwell on another point—the so-called overpayments which have emerged at our enterprises. Although these overpayments amounted to just R14 billion, and this is small change compared with the R100 billion deficit, we should take a look at them nonetheless.

Many trade union representatives have spoken here. They have decried cooperatives and economists very vigorously. But when it came to defending labor collectives' interests before the government, they kept their

heads down for some reason. Yet I have a pile of telegrams from labor collectives, letters in which they ask for the question of these controls over the correlation between labor productivity and wages to be raised. Here is what workers at Moscow's "Pluton" plant wrote—they sent me a collective letter. They wrote: "The imposition of the ban on wage growth exceeding productivity growth is preventing us from reducing prime cost." I will explain that for the noneconomists among us. For instance, I have an article costing R1,000, and now I can reduce its prime cost to R950 by saving materials. But in order to obtain this saving in materials I have to pay R25 to those who save the materials. From the boss' standpoint the situation is quite elementary. I gain 50, I spend 25. From the standpoint of the authors of this restriction, it seems that the price is the same—R1,000—but wages have gone up by R25. This means that this road must not be followed. They reject this saving.

Moreover, the workers' letter states that this correlation reduces the incentive to cut staff; they write that a desire emerges to employ more lower-paid workers so as to maintain average wage levels. Let me explain once again. For instance, 6 people work in a section and earn R200 each. Now they decide to work as a team of five, but they ask that the five who remain be paid not an extra R200 in place of the sixth worker, but R250, for instance. Again, from the economic standpoint this is an entirely beneficial operation because, although I pay the five R50 more, I gain a worker who can be used in another section. But in this case, from the standpoint of the authors of the correlation, this approach is completely unacceptable because average wages increase.

Therefore, the workers conclude in their letter—I'll read it since it's very interesting (the letter is interesting in general; it is hand-written, but there are many signatures on it): "In December the Council of Ministers introduced an anti-inflationary correlation which, from our standpoint as workers, demonstrated complete ignorance of the subject on the part of high-ranking officials." (Applause).

Now I would like to add some comments of my own. Say I manufacture 10 refrigerators in my section. Suppose wages account for 50 percent of the cost of each refrigerator. It transpires that an 11th refrigerator can be manufactured in the section. But wages will account for more than 50 percent of the cost of this 11th refrigerator.

Of course, in this case state profits will fall, but, on the other hand, there will be an additional refrigerator, demand will be met, shortages will be reduced, there will be something to spend money on, and a blow will be struck against inflation. But the idea of controls over the correlation between labor productivity and wages proceeds from a different premise. Its premise is that wages should account for the same proportion of each additional refrigerator. That is, in other words, they are not interested in additional output but in maintaining state income.

Personally, it seems to me that even if the state doesn't earn a ruble from extra meat, an extra refrigerator, or an extra pair of shoes they should be produced, regardless of any correlations. (Applause).

Measures to control the correlation between labor productivity and wages suit only the apparatus, they do not eliminate any shortages, they merely create the semblance of combating shortages. But to all intents and purposes this is an attempt to lumber labor collectives with the leadership's inability to resolve economic problems.

How else is it suggested that we eliminate our crisis? There is talk of additional production of goods. Production of this will increase, production of that will grow, and so forth. What I want to ask is: Has our country ever had a government which did not promise to increase production of something or other? No it hasn't. Has there been a government in the country which has not found itself faced with growing shortages after a few years? Again no. Just why, one wonders?

Because it is not a question of the government, or of leaders, or of good intentions. Our economic science has been decried here probably also because it has demonstrated that the reason lies in the objective economic management mechanism. As long as the existing social relations in production continue, as long as the existing economic base continues, as long as the existing economic mechanism continues, as long as the existing political superstructure continues, there will be no adequate effect, however many extra billions of the people's money we invest in production. That is a fact of past experience, and we should make it our starting point. (Applause).

That is why it seems to me that it would be entirely insufficient for deputies to take promises of additional production at face value.

If the report had shown that we have now created a new economic mechanism capable of creating rather than spending, then it could have been believed. If the report had proved that we now have a machine capable not only of burning fuel but of going somewhere, then its promises could have been believed, too. For the time being all the remedies for the next 2 years as a whole have been taken from the arsenal of bureaucratic administration. But how can the consequences of administrative measures be cured by administrative measures? It seems to me that we want to act like a drug addict who cures his shakes with another fix. These, as has been said here, are draconian measures. I am not about to particularly go into them any further. I am comforted by the fact that we do not actually have a Draco, and consequently the draconian measures will most likely remain on paper. In practice they are unlikely to do any great damage. To be serious, the financial crisis is a reflection of the economic crisis. That is why the extensive criticism of the Ministry of Finance or the State Committee on Prices is only relatively fair. We latch onto the outward manifestations of the disease. Finances are the thermometer. They show

the patient's temperature. If we are going to fight, why fight the thermometer and the temperature? We should cure the disease.

In general it is time to stop portraying ourselves as trailblazers. Inflation has been a feature of all 20th-century economies in all countries. Starting with Keynes, whole schools of economists have studied this process. The bourgeois states have many years of experience of efforts in this area. They have learned to live with inflation. Anyone who travels abroad can see when you go back the next time that prices have risen. But everyone can also see something else—people live better. Yet the very word "inflation" throws us into a panic. Why? Because we live by the ideas of "Das Kapital"—a brilliantly analytical book, but one which reflects the situation a century ago. Who among our economic managers has ever studied neo-Keynesianism?

On the whole the problem itself—improving the economy and getting out of the crisis—is incorrectly formulated. If we improved the economy and emerged from the crisis, we would not need any restructuring. Isn't the reason why certain figures cling so vigorously to the idea of emergency measures that they want to dodge the actual problem of restructuring?

It has to be said with the utmost clarity: Emergency measures will not provide either a genuine improvement or a genuine overcoming of the financial crisis. (Applause). And this will emerge quite quickly.

Realistic tasks must be set for these measures. Not the improvement of the economy—that is a task beyond the power of emergency measures. But the creation of the preconditions for accelerating restructuring is feasible. It is from that viewpoint that we should approach the whole problem of emergency measures—what among these emergency measures will help to accelerate restructuring.

In the next part of my speech I would like to dwell on the model of restructuring. In order to create some emergency programs, it is necessary to know exactly what our aim is. As the saying goes, if you don't know which way to head, no wind can be a fair wind.

I would like to elucidate a few points when discussing this problem of the model which we should espouse.

The first problem relates to the subject who is to implement the package of restructuring measures.

The government's view is that all parameters should be worked out here, at the center. It will be necessary to issue 50 laws—but I think 50 will not be enough, we will need 100. If our Supreme Soviet works from morning to night and discusses them article by article, these 100 laws on restructuring may be ready in about 5 years.

Representatives from the Baltic republics think that we should hand over the decisive, overwhelming proportion of the economy to the republics, and then each republic will determine which economic model will be introduced. One republic may hang on to kolkhozes [collective farms], another may favor individual farmsteads, and so forth.

I think we should follow a path whereby the center issues just a few fundamental acts defining the general principles of the economic mechanism and creating a common economic basis in all republics. But the bulk of the legislation must nonetheless be handed over to the republics. (Applause).

Comrades, I need another 10 minutes, but I could also cut it short. (Noise in the auditorium).

A.I. Lukyanov: What do you think, comrades?

Auditorium: The standing orders!

A.I. Lukyanov: The standing orders? Gavriil Kharitonovich, the standing orders. (Noise in the auditorium). Please pay attention. Shall we put it to a vote?

Voices from the floor: Yes.

A.I. Lukyanov: Then I'm ready to vote.

Who is in favor of giving Comrade Popov 10 minutes? The majority. Ten minutes, go ahead.

G.Kh. Popov: Thank you, 10 minutes will be enough.

Comrades, talking about the republics, I think in general that it is time we abandoned the Stalinist interpretation of dividing republics into autonomous republics and union republics. I think that the overwhelming majority of our autonomous republics should become normal union republics and function as such. (Applause).

The second problem of the model. This is the problem of changing ownership relations and their content. The report included the concept of changing production relations. But we should no longer talk in general terms, we have to be specific. And, specifically, the problem is the following. If we proceed on the basis of Marxism, it is necessary to bring production relations and ownership relations into line with productive forces.

In our administrative system there has been, first, a general statization [ogosudarstvleniye] and, second, a general centralization. Both have done violence to the objective economy.

One wonders, for instance, what state ownership relations or centralization are needed by the person who sells us our newspapers on the newsstand? Why should there be rayon, city, oblast, and republic Soyuzpechat [Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter] departments on top of a single news vendor? To make sure that there are ultimately two bureaucrats for each newspaper-seller?

It seems to me that this system is, of course, not entirely Marxist. We need to take a realistic approach to the problem of ownership.

The experience of the developed capitalist countries shows that the state sector accounts for approximately 30-40 percent in economically developed countries. I think that bearing in mind our traditions and the interests of social orientation, it is enough for the state to retain control of 50 percent of the economy. The remaining 50 percent should be handed over to cooperatives and the private, individual sector.

We should also pursue decentralization within the framework of state ownership itself. Clearly, two-fifths of this ownership should be concentrated in the hands of the local soviets, two-fifths in the hands of the republics, and one-fifth in the hands of the center, the entire union.

Incidentally, we will then really resolve the problem of centralism. Here I wholly agree with Nikolay Ivanovich, when he said that we should concentrate on shock areas where a breakthrough can be made. In particular, I resolutely support all those who say that space spending should not be cut back but increased. This is an area where we have surged forward and where we can and should make some money in the world market. (Applause).

I would think it could be quite normal for us to buy cars from those who have long since outpaced us and whom we will never catch.

But, in order for Nikolay Ivanovich to concentrate on space, he has to be relieved of washing powder and dozens of other matters which are currently the government's concern. That is why the restructuring of ownership relations is the foundation of all other changes.

The next problem in the future economic management model is the problem of family peasant farms.

For me this is one of the central questions of our restructuring. The idea expressed here that the choice between kolkhoz, sovkhoz [state farm], and family peasant farm should be made in the market and in the course of competition is correct.

But when I listened to this correct statement, I could not tell whether equal conditions for all will be created to ensure that this market and this competition exist.

What kind of equality is there if some have land and others do not? Where will local soviets get the land to lease out? We are told that they will get it from farms which go bankrupt. But I have learned from our agrarian specialists' letter that apparently all farms should have all their debts written off. Where will the bankrupts come from if everyone has their debts written off?

It seems to me that we need to think harder about our country's experience. In 1861, when the reform was carried out, there was an opportunity to free the peasants and settle them on the land. Then they would feed themselves and the state. A different decision was made—to suit the landowners. The peasants were emancipated, but the landowners retained the land, the peasants had to lease land from the landowners, feed themselves, and, in addition, feed the state and the landowners. It is not very hard to imagine which road it is proposed that we follow now. The only thing I want to say is that this road ultimately led to three Russian revolutions. (Applause).

I am scared by our stubborn reluctance to take account of world agricultural experience. The entire experience of all prosperous countries shows that family peasant farms and farmers are the basis of the economy.

We have followed a different path from the very beginning of our history. At the end of the last century it was discovered that the Marxist theory that in agriculture large-scale production will triumph over small-scale production was not vindicated. Then Marxists—Kautskiy and Lenin—instead of admitting the facts, started criticizing the theory of stable small-scale peasant farms.

The struggle against family peasant farms was on our banners in 1917 and doomed our country to civil war.

Distrust of family peasant farms wrecked the New Economic Policy.

The slander alleging that family farms constantly give rise to capitalism led to the dispossession of the kulaks and collectivization.

Once again distrust of family farms led Comrade Khrushchev to combat personal plots and ultimately doomed all Khrushchev's reforms to failure. How long are we going to fail to take account of reality?

The March plenum has now finally stated that socialism is incompatible with private farms. But this theoretical conclusion has not been embodied in a specific program of action.

I am scared by the latest readiness to spend more billions. These billions were previously spent on chemicalization, then they were spent on land reclamation, now they must allegedly be spent on the social sphere on the grounds that this will apparently produce some results.

Why send people to the countryside, if 5 percent of a population can feed an entire country anywhere in the world under normal production relations? (Applause).

This is a key issue, comrades. If we feed the country with the help of family peasant farms, we will avoid having to import food. By avoiding food imports, we will release hard currency for ruble convertibility. We will further release capital investment from the excessive development of the oil and gas industry, which is plundering our natural resources and polluting our environment. There is a whole string of consequences.

I oppose any bureaucratic system of administration. I am confident that very many kolkhozes, kolkhoz members, sovkhozes, and sovkhoz workers will be efficient economic managers if the fetters of bureaucratic administration are removed from them. I am in favor of one thing only—actually ensuring the equality of all masters in the countryside. This is what needs to be ensured in

practice. Competition and the market will show who is most efficient. I am absolutely sure that competition in this country will have the same effect as it has worldwide. Tens of thousands of farmers go bust in the United States every year, but their place is taken not by large farms but by other farmers.

One final problem on which I would like to dwell. This is the problem of distribution according to labor and social guarantees.

I am somewhat troubled by the abundance of various measures in the social sphere contained in the program. Why? Well, I can understand why candidates campaigning for votes put this forward.

But what do one-shot additional money payments mean? Today they are either compensation for price growth in the past or a certain advance for price growth in the future. If prices rise, if it is hard to get cheap goods, the additional money becomes worthless in a year or two. That is quite obvious.

If we are really concerned about the less well-off we need not just a one-shot payment (which is necessary in itself) but a constant coefficient for annually adjusting all firm payments in the national economy in line with a cost-of-living index. This would be real concern. (Applause).

Second, it is necessary to set up guaranteed systems for the less well-off to obtain access to cheap goods. This is also a very substantive and important issue.

But nonetheless the most important thing is that the people should not be given the impression that our state has some kind of granary, and that if they pressure the state, kick up a fuss, and take to the streets the state will draw something out of the granary and make everybody happy. (Applause). This is an entirely impermissible policy.

The people have to be told the truth. Even if you repair your apartment there are loads of problems. And if we are to engage in restructuring, we will have a very hard time. Any statements to the effect that we will carry out restructuring while increasing prosperity are essentially direct deceptions of the people, deliberate or not. (Applause).

We deputies and the congress must say: We have one way out—real, hard, difficult work. What must we do? We must give everyone who wants to work the opportunity to work efficiently. We must concentrate on that. The crux of the problem is not what should be divided up and how, but that those who want to work should be given the opportunity to do so.

An enormous section of our society needs social protection. There are people who cannot work. Invalids, large families, and so forth naturally need an entire aid program. But the vast majority of our population needs to be given the chance to work, not social security and aid.

Dozens of people continually grab us by the hand near the Kremlin and thrust letters upon all deputies. What do these letters contain? Mainly people ask for apartments. Just think: A healthy man leaves a city somewhere in the Ukraine, comes here, and stands outside for hours. Why? To change something with regard to his apartment problem instead of working for this apartment. We have created a system under which people cannot solve the problem through their own labor.... (Applause).

Nikolay Andreyevich Kasyan—someone whom I very much respect—has spoken here. He called for an end to rallies, saying that we must work.

When I hear such statements from leaders, what I understand is "You work, I'll go on leading you." But when this is said by such a great worker as Nikolay Andreyevich, I nonetheless have to say to him: Nikolay Andreyevich, my dear fellow, I visited you more than 10 years ago. Then we discussed the construction of your center, and some prosecutors or financial organs were taking you to court. Now more than 10 years have passed. In any other country of the world a doctor such as yourself would now have dozens of centers. What is the case here? As I understood it from your speech, the same old discussions about construction and the same old attempts to take you to court are still going on. Why have you accomplished considerably less than you could have during these last few years, despite working unremittingly? Because the same thing has been happening to you as has been happening to all of us. We all work in a system in which our work produces considerably smaller returns than similar work in other countries. People go to rallies not because they want to hold rallies. They see no guarantees for their future and no way out in work. Their wants are very small. They want a system in which they can earn clothes, housing, and food through their own work.

In order to make our work efficient, unlike the current situation, we need to restructure our society. We will be unable to achieve material benefits for our voters, but we must create a system in society under which working people can depend on themselves alone and on their labor. Thank you! (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is granted to Comrade Yakubov. Deputy Ostroukhov will be next.

A. Yakubov, writer, first secretary of the board of the Uzbekistan Writers' Union, and secretary of the board of the USSR Writers' Union, Tashkent (from the USSR Writers' Union): Dear comrades! Time is valuable, and therefore I am omitting the entire intellectual part of my speech on lofty, global problems. I am getting down to business. Among the many values that we have increasingly lost in the course of 70 long years because of the eternal disorganization of our everyday life, our inadequate nutrition, and our kilometer-long lines that demean human dignity, there is one that is difficult to replace. That is the loss of the most noble of human qualities—mercy and compassion. They are being

crowded out by embitterment and an unwillingness to listen to one another and sympathize with another person's misfortune.

On Friday [9 June], while walking past two very attractive, pretty women in the lobby, I involuntarily heard the following conversation: "Why are the Uzbeks always complaining about their cotton?" one of them said. "You get sick of it; they have nothing spiritual," the other added. And I thought with bitterness: So who is to blame for the fact that our once courageous, proud Uzbek peasant and his beautiful black-browed women find themselves in such a tragic situation?

But how can they be spiritually developed when, because of the infamous slogan of the "father of all times and peoples," Stalin, concerning the country's independence in cotton, they have been deprived of everything? All of their land, hundreds of thousands of hectares of marvelous fruit orchards, eternally green alfalfa fields, and even shady nut and almond groves—all that was cruelly cut down, plowed up, and sown to unrewarding cotton, as Chingiz Aytmatov has called it.

From the vast flood of sensational materials in the press that have rained down like a hail storm on the republic, I suppose you have already figured out to the kopek how much money each of our embezzlers stole. Embezzlers must be punished. There can be no two opinions about that. But what person who does not live in Uzbekistan can cross his heart and say with a clear conscience what sort of position our cotton grower has found himself in because of that same unrewarding cotton, cotton which the State Planning Committee [Gosplan] claims is a strategic raw material, brings vast revenues to the state, constitutes the lion's share of our foreign-exchange income, and without which, that same Gosplan admits, the state cannot get by? What are the living conditions of that peasant and his unfortunate wife, who is crushed by relentless toil? How much do these people receive?

Our women are employed at work that is not intended for women, under the radiation of the sun. That sun, as well as the insane use of toxic chemicals, has resulted in a sharp increase in cancerous, gastrointestinal, and women's illnesses, and women's and child mortality.

And how is their everyday life arranged? It is arranged in such a way that our women cotton growers, returning from the fields at twilight, cook broth for their children by burning antediluvian, filthy dried dung in their fireplaces. And it is hard not to cry when you look at these swarthy women, who in some respects resemble fire-scorched birches, in whom nothing feminine remains—neither breasts, nor bottom—to look at their eyes, filled with hopeless grief and sadness.

I recognize that all the country's peasants have it hard, Russian peasants especially, and I am glad that our government is taking fundamental measures to rectify this situation. But for all that, comrades, cotton is a special case. Let us recall those white, cruel-hearted farmers from the American South who, not wanting to work in the cotton fields themselves, and protecting their women and children from this inhuman labor, brought hundreds of thousands of Negroes from Africa in shackles. But in all fairness, let us also recall that, while motivated by the goal of not working, protecting their children from hard labor in those cotton fields, and receiving the healthy working offspring of the slaves, these cruel farmers fed them amply. And up sprung strapping, two-meter tall blacks whose descendants today are the flower of American sports, and the arts as well.

And what about our village children? How can one talk of sports or of their spiritual development? Because of malnutrition (20 kg of meat per capita) and work that is unsuited for children, they are not even accepted into the Army, and if they are accepted, it is only into construction battalions. And so, after this account, which is not even complete, of the dramatic situation of our peasant, I want to ask you, esteemed Nikolay Ivanovich: Is Gosplan's claim that the country needs cotton so much, that it is a strategic raw material and provides the lion's share of foreign-exchange revenues, true? And if it is true, then why is our price for cotton the lowest in the world? (Applause).

After all, Nikolay Ivanovich, we know from the prerevolutionary TURKESTANSKIYE VEDOMOSTI that the Russian merchant (the same one who brought this unrewarding crop to our region) would give 18 poods of wheat for one pood of cotton. Yet our own socialist state pays an average of 50 kopeks per kilogram, which is exactly what a half-kilogram of cucumbers costs at the Alayskiy Market in Tashkent (let's not forget, comrades, that two shirts costing at least R50 each can be sewn from the fabric produced from a kilogram of cotton).

It is stated back in the historical annals that in terms of its climatic and natural conditions Central Asia has no equals in the world, that the sweetest fruits and vegetables on the planet are grown there, and that its melons and watermelons are priceless for their taste and aroma.

Over the 70 years of our state's existence, as the result of the thoughtless, antiscientific, cruel exploitation of its natural resources, our region has been brought to the brink of ecological disaster.

Comrades, yesterday you did not listen to me fully; more precisely, you did not fully listen to the idea that Academician Aganbegyan expressed. Last year at a conference in the CPSU Central Committee devoted to the problem of the Aral, Academician Aganbegyan said that no one knows the real cause of the anomalies that have occurred in Uzbekistan with respect to its nature, its land and, finally, its people. And, he said, in setting any given tasks for the republic, Gosplan and the country's State Agroindustrial Committee are sailing in the fog. Therefore, the academician proposed, it is necessary to set up a special, authoritative economic commission consisting of the most prominent economists, ecologists, and medical and agricultural specialists, a commission which, after a

thorough study of matters, would present the government with a full and clear picture of what is happening in Uzbekistan.

I am convinced that Uzbekistan can feed half the country, comrades, and not in the distant future but in the next few years. For this to happen the republic must resolutely be freed from the domination of monoculture, and its industrious people must be helped to distance themselves from the shock of the stagnation years and straighten their shoulders.

My time is out, and I shall end on this. But I ask you to adopt my proposal for the establishment of a special commission. Thank you. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is granted to Deputy Ostroukhov. Deputy Bykov will be next.

V.A. Ostroukhov, secretary of the party committee of the Sibkabel Production Association, Tomsk (from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union). Comrade deputies! Our congress is approaching its end. On the whole, it has been a new and unprecedented event. We obviously have yet to appraise it and interpret it. However, it is already clear that this event will move us considerably forward along the path of restructuring.

Comrades, for 20 years I worked as a mill operator in one of the hardest shops in cable production. Now I have been elected secretary of the party committee, that is, to translate it into the language of some who have been speaking now—into an apparatchik. And we have a good many of such people in the party. Like many others, I cannot conceive of my work without people, their needs and concerns. Therefore, such statements on the part of some speakers affect me in a rather unpleasant way. After all, what is happening today? Many Communists, workers, are keeping quiet out of modesty, recognizing their responsibility both for the party's past and for the present, while others are putting themselves forward as the ideologists of restructuring. Yet we all know that the generators of the ideas of restructuring are the CPSU Central Committee and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. And to speak in a general way, it is all of us together, our entire party. Some speakers have correctly noted here that the party continues to be society's guiding force under the new conditions. While restructuring itself, it invites all public organizations and movements to join in concerted actions to renew our country.

Restructuring, as we have all felt, is difficult but interesting work. The importance of the political reform that is being carried out in the country is especially great. But the fate of restructuring, and I am certain of this, will in many respects be decided, nonetheless, in the area of the economy. Let us improve the economic situation, and I am certain that all other areas of restructuring will start proceeding more dynamically. I became convinced of this once again in listening to Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report.

It turns out that in more than 70 years of the Soviet regime we have still not sorted out what state ownership, public ownership, and ownership by the people are. In the final analysis, as many economists have rightfully noted here in their interesting speeches, we have created ownership by no one. And ownership by no one means no one's property. That is the reason for the indifferent attitude toward it.

What is the solution here? Our plant's collective is coming out, in its deeds, for the new forms of economic management, the broadest introduction of cost accounting at all levels of the state structure—from the shop to the ministry—and the introduction of leasing and cooperative relations. What are we afraid of? After all, this is our socialist path.

Today five shops in our association are working under leasing arrangements, and three shops have been turned into production cooperatives. Let me note from the outset that one of the chief points of their contracts with the association's management is the maintenance of existing prices for the output they produce. Our party organization, the labor collective's council, and all the workers are opposed in principle to those cooperatives that receive unearned income by sharply raising prices. I believe this is an issue of state importance. We favor cooperatives that, by combining personal interest and independence, increase their income by increasing production volumes, improving quality, and updating products. Let us carefully think once again about the meaning of the speech by Deputy Shcherbakov from Moscow, who spoke of the fact that some cooperatives are discrediting the generally noble ideas of the cooperative movement in our country.

Our collective's goal is to create a lease-based cooperative association. And we are getting support from the ministry in this regard. But in the development of the cooperative movement there are a good many problems, which have been mentioned more than once here.

First of all, there is the unequal position of state cooperative enterprises, especially in the distribution of income, which is having negative consequences. Extremely serious and prompt changes and filling in of omissions are required in this part of the Law on Cooperatives.

Secondly, I believe that normative rates for the distribution of profits have been set unfairly. This is preventing collectives from moving on from the first model of cost accounting to the second. Let's say a collective in our country is left only 30 percent of the profits. We favor a flexible approach but oppose the mentality according to which any additional thousand rubles that a collective keeps for itself is equated with an act of sabotage against socialism. In this connection the Law on the State Enterprise also needs clarification. And, of course, it needs to be carried out.

The USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems recently created serious obstacles to the development

of the cooperative movement by adopting a decision to eliminate all social benefits for cooperative movements, including pension benefits connected with hazardous working conditions. Here I am mainly speaking of cooperatives created on the basis of industrial enterprises, and I believe that this measure is premature; it is a matter of jumping the gun. Such an approach only impedes the development of the cooperative movement in industry. The new government and the All-Union Council of Trade Unions must resolutely remove the barriers to leasing arrangements and cooperatives that have been erected in the quiet of Moscow offices.

At our congress people have spoken of the role of scientific and technological progress somehow under their breath. Yet the West has made a leap forward by introducing scientific advances into production. We all know examples of this. I think that the present strained situation in our economy has come about primarily because the country has not yet created an effective economic mechanism that provides incentives for the introduction of advanced accomplishments into practice. We hoped that the shift to cost accounting would bring a revolution in technological progress along with it. But, as we see, today these hopes have not been borne out. I think that the economists should still speak their minds here. This is the area in which we should accomplish a breakthrough.

Comrades! We listened closely to Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report. I think that no one disputes the fact that it is a logical continuation of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report. The Tomsk delegation fully supports the election of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov as chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. But we also have very great complaints against the work of the government, especially in solving the problem of Siberia. I speak with confidence precisely of solving a problem, and not of resolving questions, because in the past few years that problem really has revealed itself distinctly. Deputies from the Far East, the Altay, and the Kuznetsk Basin have also spoken of this here.

The vast territory from the Urals to the Pacific Ocean really does continue to be a raw-materials appendage. Trains carrying coal, timber, and metal come from there day and night. Pipelines pump hundreds of millions of tonnes of oil and billions of cubic meters of gas. But against that background, under the most severe natural and climatic conditions, the living standard of Siberians has not been improving, and by many indicators it remains lower than in the country's center. One must not forget the extreme Siberian cold, the mosquitoes, and the other bloodsucking insects of our short summer. There are no roads or schools. Villagers cannot utilize the gas that runs by the village through a gas pipeline. Today it is no longer necessary to put quotation marks around the notion of hardy Siberian health. Yet the problem of the Siberian countryside is another whole big topic of discussion. And all of these problems come from a departmental approach to the development of natural resources.

It is this consumeristic approach that has given rise to a number of serious environmental problems. It is perfectly obvious that the country should have a comprehensive program for the development of Siberia's natural resources with emphasis on the thorough local processing of extracted raw materials. And the main thing is to create the social conditions that are needed to attract people and keep them there. I want to say one more time, loud and clear, at this congress: If a drastic improvement is not made in people's lives in Siberia in the near future, this mighty source of raw materials will prove to be lost to the country. There will be no one to cut timber, mine coal, extract gas, etc.

I especially want to mention various shortages. They create inconveniences and cause irritation among people in any part of the country and, believe me, especially in Siberia. I realize that interruptions in supply can occur, but when the most basic consumer items are lacking (and for a year, or 2 years, and under the conditions of restructuring), you get flustered and cannot find any explanation when you are asked about this in labor collectives. And so you think: Just where is Nikolay Ivanovich with his government, and where are Gosplan and the ministries, of which we have more than enough? It would be a good idea to create a service in the country for responding to such acute situations, which affect the interests of millions of people.

In conclusion I would like once more, comrades, to speak about the party. I believe that it is in the critical stages of the history of our party and society as a whole that the Communist's steadfastness, conviction, and faith in his ideals are tested. In this connection I am disturbed and concerned by attempts, and they have been heard here at the congress, to belittle the party's role in our life and in restructuring. Such attempts do not follow the channel of restructuring. They are pursuing some sort of other goals. Just yesterday that sort of "nod" was made in the direction of the Kremlin leadership. In general, comrades, we need more trust in one another. After all, we are working for the common cause.

For example, I have known Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev for many years. I know him as an energetic, businesslike person who is devoted to the party's cause. And when we speak here of Comrade Ligachev, whether we want to or not, we cast a shadow on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, as well. That is how I understand it. Therefore, let us respect one another and trust and support the Politburo, which is at our party's head, more. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is granted to Deputy Bykov. Next will be Comrade Bresis.

R.A. Bykov, artistic director of the Yunost Association of Mosfilm [Moscow Film Studio], secretary of the Board of the USSR Cinematographers' Union, Moscow (from the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Foundation): Esteemed comrade chairman, and dear colleagues, people's deputies! I have taken the floor in order to propose that we

take a look at the problems under discussion with one adjustment—through the prism of culture, spirituality, childhood, and the human being. It seems to me that it is time to speak this word at the congress. It seems to me that in our great congress marathon, in this huge television show the likes of which the world has never seen and the significance of which, in my opinion, we have not yet comprehended, because it entails solving the problems of democracy in full public view, the results of our work will echo in people's hearts through a purely real-life analysis. And if we do not yet know right now how we have done, depending on what sort of situation comes about in the country, we will realize that it represents our contribution to all that is good and all that is bad.

When I say that we should think of the human being, I say it in order that we recognize that among other, extremely important shortages, there is a shortage of intelligence, a shortage of education, a shortage of responsibility, a shortage of discipline, kindness and mercy, a shortage of beautiful relations. And when we speak of the economy and speak of the means of production and resources, we realize that all this is set into motion only in a system of production relations. And production relations are human relations.

I played a role in "Pisma mertvovogo cheloveka" [Letters of a Dead Man] and sat for a year in a cellar thinking about the end of the world—that was necessary in the course of working on the part. For a whole year I thought about the fact that humanity was supposed to be on the point of perishing, and that gave me a new perspective, and I would ride around Leningrad every evening and look at people, who were so carefree, and think: Can it be that they do not realize where we are going? After all, the same unprecedented transmutations that are taking place in the soil and taking place in the air are taking place in our souls. After all, the instinct for self-preservation, which used to move civilization, is being supplanted before our very eyes by the instinct for self-destruction. This is the beginning of an apocalyptic consciousness. We speak of the fact that we are having difficulty with the economy, and we say: Here are additional difficulties—Chernobyl, the disaster in Bashkiria, the harsh circumstances that existed in Sumgait, the harsh circumstances that came about in Uzbekistan. Of course, this reflects a lack of discipline, laxness, the intensity of the nationality struggle, and omissions. But all of that also has its own reasons—a shortage of general culture and morality, and human relations that we wrote off, that we have failed to take into account economically. And how has it happened that in our country children, culture, and education have ended up in the so-called sphere of the residual principle?

We are now asking about nuclear energy and the chemicalization of the country, and we will soon be talking about biological technologies that are no less dangerous, but very effective. And I want to ask whether we have thought these matters through from the standpoint of the human being. After all, if equipment for the education of schoolchildren in Sweden is reckoned at a thousand dollars, and R58 is spent for the education of one of our schoolchildren, that represents a definite sort of preparation of the future specialist. Whereas we spend R12,000 a year to train a specialist in our best higher schools, and one-third to one-half that amount in our pedagogical institutes, the developed capitalist countries spend $80,000 to train a specialist. So what are they doing, wasting money? And how is it that we want to do for R12,000 what costs $80,000? I think that what one can turn out for that sort of money is not a specialist but a model of a specialist, and a nonworking model at that. With that sort of specialists, that sort of culture of relations, just where are we going in the age of atomic energy, the age of chemicalization and biological technologies? This is a degree of risk that is no longer warranted. In present-day technologies there is a concept known as the human degree of risk; without it an economy is not modern; without taking the present-day human being into account, an economy becomes backward.

Our ruble should be backed up in human terms, because when we invest a ruble in production, we should know that R10 or R20 must be invested in the intellectual and human support for production. That is where it gets its backing from, and the malicious words once spoken by Saltykov-Shchedrin come to mind: Right now intelligent people give a 50-kopek piece for our ruble, and soon they will give a sock in the face. (Applause).

It is extremely important to call attention to how we approach the problems of our children. First of all, politically. Here very great changes have taken place in the past 50 years, within my lifetime. I was brought up in the Moscow City Pioneers' House, for which a palace had been turned over; it had been the palace of a count, and it had marble and circular staircases. And I would come from the Zamoskvorechye district, from the communal apartment where I lived—43 rooms with one kitchen—and I knew that this had been given to children by our state and our revolution. The palaces had been turned over to children. I arrived in the city of Naberezhnyye Chelny and saw the sole palace in the middle of the city. It was built of white stone, and I was told with pride that the largest square in Europe would be built right there. It would be built on landfill; of course, it was necessary there in the city of Naberezhnyye Chelny. We would not have understood that, if we had not recalled that it had recently been named the city of Brezhnev. And so there stands that white stone palace, and it is occupied, of course, not by children but by the city party committee and soviet executive committee, while the Pioneers' House—that is, the Pioneers' Palace—is located in the entryway to a prefabricated five-story apartment building in a housing tract. It's not a Pioneers' Palace, it's a Pioneers' entryway. (Applause). A speaker just now said that one must not belittle the role of the party. Dear friends, party members, and nonmembers! The role of the party can be belittled only by the party itself through its actions. (Applause). And one does not need to cast a shadow on the party; that shadow is cast of its own accord by that palace in Naberezhnyye Chelny. I spoke with a secretary of the city party committee [gorkom], a

young, worthy, intelligent man; I don't know, maybe he is listening to me. I want to say to him: We did not speak of it, but I guessed from his eyes that he was dreaming of coming forth with an initiative—to turn that palace over to the children. (Laughter, applause).

If we are speaking of the economics of our children, which are also reflected in our entire economy, then allow me to ask you: How has it happened, our dear friends, that, while we have the slogans "All the best for children!" and "Children are a privileged class!" everything has been taken away from children. Two percent of all the money the budget allocates for sports goes to children, and the rest has been taken by you adults.

How has it happened that the average cost of a public building in the country is R250 per square meter, while the average cost of a school is R37 per square meter, and the average cost of a fully equipped hog barn is R43 a square meter? How has it happened, and what do we expect from a generation, if club doors are closed to them, if access to books is practically closed to them, and if there are 42 of them in a classroom? This is a special accomplishment of our pedagogy. I remember how during the war we Leningraders and Muscovites came to the city of Yoshkar-Ola, and there were not enough schools. And they made a third shift, and classes were held in the boiler rooms, but it never occurred to anyone to put more than 25 children in a classroom. It has long occurred to me that the person who thought up that idea of putting 42 children in a single room and letting them work there for 10 years is figuring out how to arrange things so that perhaps there can be a second shift.

We are presently organizing committees of the Supreme Soviet. I would like to express disagreement with the preliminary decision; the committee on children should be separate, although I myself realize that that is very complicated. One committee for science, public education, culture and upbringing; and of course, it should include children. But there is another committee—on the family and motherhood, and it, too, of course, should include children. I think that the approach to committees from the standpoint of linear structures has long since become obsolete. Shouldn't we propose a matrix system to our Supreme Soviet, so that committees will be local, and so that a combination of committees can be put together and assigned to a specific, individual problem?

We say: There is an inseparable link between "mother" and "child," "mother" and "family." Of course, but today we have come to such a state of moral decline of society that this link has been broken in our country. We say that there are no children without a mother. There are, dear friends! There are children without a mother, and a good many of them. More than a million children have been turned over to children's homes and orphanages, which is more than after the war; this is a moral disaster on the level of the Great Patriotic War, the most terrible war in history and in the history of our people. Our mothers did not abandon us, although they had it harder. Why, then, can a mother abandon a child today? It is because that sort of moral climate exists in society. Because if a mother abandoned us, everyone would turn their backs on her, her parents would not let her across the threshold of their home, she would never marry, and all her friends would turn their backs on her. But now the mother and father will confer, and her friends will help, and an intelligent young man will take her for a wife, because she's no dumb girl.

I want to say that the main thing today is to understand that the problems of children and culture, economics, finances, and restructuring as a whole are the problems of our human relations. We can build yet more electric power plants, endeavor to solve problems, and endeavor to create democracy; but democracy is not an order, it is a level of culture, a level of education, a level of kindness. The state itself should become moral, and the law should become moral. If wages do not respect work, if no one respects work, then we will never, through any lessons of work, teach people to respect work. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is granted to Deputy Bresis. Next will be Deputy Marinichev.

V.-E.G. Bresis, chairman of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, Riga City (Yekabpilsskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Latvian SSR): Esteemed deputies, I am sure that one of the merits of our congress is that it has conducted a thorough analysis of the state of the country's social and economic life. It is as if we have chosen the construction site for a new building and intend to start drawing up the plans in the near future.

However, a sense of incompleteness and contradiction on some questions is a source of concern to us. It is true that we have mastered the constructive methods of new political thinking in foreign policy. We have looked confidently into the 21st century and reassured and convinced the whole world with our confidence. But here at home we have embarked on economic restructuring without the most important thing—a scientifically substantiated concept. Consequently, decisions made by the government lack clear strategic guidelines and are often contradictory or even wrong.

It seems to me that two approaches are emerging at our congress. The first approach is to patch up the old mechanism, the second is to create a qualitatively new one. We are unconditionally in favor of the latter, a part of which is the idea of decentralizing the economy and increasing initiative and responsibility at all levels, on the basis of local conditions. The report also talked of the need to transfer the republics to economic accountability. If this idea is not distorted in practice, along with other economic actions it will undoubtedly lead to a new state of our economy.

However, at times feelings run high over the question of economic accountability for the republics. Especially when some deputies, including from our republic, give their own distorted interpretation of this question. That is why I feel it necessary to dwell on this subject again.

Indeed, the exceptionally high degree of centralization of production management and the mobilization of most resources in the hands of the administrative system have essentially created an extremely powerful braking and apathy mechanism. For example, 82 percent of all output produced in the republic is still distributed on a centralized basis. One wonders who has any interest in showing local initiative in these conditions? The notorious formula "initiative is punishable" operates strictly and rigorously. Newly produced output will once again be distributed by the center and only an insignificant proportion of this output or, at best, some of the above-plan output will be left for the initiators. What is more, Latvia has reached a period of economic development when most of the factors for increasing production, such as labor, energy, raw material, and ecological resources, are virtually exhausted, leaving the intensification factor as the main one. Consequently, our economic well-being in the future lies not in production per se but in producing more output of better quality and value. However, we will be able to realize our efforts and improve the republic's standard of living only on the basis of equivalent commodity exchange in the conditions of a union market. And by equivalent exchange we mean not only the exchange of material wealth but also the provision of services and finance and credit relations with the union. The crux of the issue is very simple. Whoever gives more to society will be able to have more himself.

Together with its neighboring republics and on the basis of approximately similar principles, Latvia is switching to a new model of socioeconomic development in 1990. An accord was reached on this with the country's government. We assumed that the central planning organs would work out the new elements of the future economic mechanism on the basis of our example. However, so-called acceptance of the plan for 1990 is literally now in progress—once again following the rules of the period of stagnation and braking.

Unfortunately, other examples also show that the country's Gosplan [State Planning Committee] is in no hurry to work out the elements of the new mechanism but, on the contrary, is continuing to strengthen centralization in planning. We ask the country's Supreme Soviet to adopt the law on regional economic accountability as quickly as possible in order to put an end to this practice. We suggest that in the new conditions, economic relations with the country's central organs and with other republics and regions be built and regulated on a mutually advantageous contract basis. It should be an economic contract under which the two sides assume the appropriate commitments.

Under the present planning system it has not been possible and will not be possible to ensure balanced plans. The main concern of Riga's numerous apparatchiks and the even more numerous apparatchiks in Moscow is still to assay, seek out, and limit. Clearly, every method is used here except a scientific method. This year, for example, despite the 100-percent state order, the plan for the republic's State Committee for Industry alone failed to balance out to the tune of R85 million. One wonders who is going to compensate the collectives? There are a mass of such instances—in other words, it has now become a system. This suits the bureaucratic apparatus. More than that, it is the circulatory system of the bureaucratic machine. It uses this to elevate itself to the pinnacle of the pyramid of economic power, while simultaneously belittling the working man. I will be frank, our specialists are not very good at wheedling and prying things out of people but they are also unaccustomed to kowtowing. That is why we are in favor of contractual principles and economic accountability. But republic economic accountability is not a subsistence economy and not economic self-isolation, as some comrades here try to make out. It is even quite the reverse: It leads to the formation of an all-union market and to the search for effective forms of all-union division of labor. Republic economic accountability also implies the right to price formation, independent management of credit resources, and the creation of mechanisms to protect the population from the vagaries of the market.

Economic sovereignty also means independent international ties and foreign currency cost-recovery. The foreign currency payments system introduced 2 and ½ years ago does not guarantee foreign currency self-financing even at the level of most enterprises, because the state takes up to 70 percent of foreign currency revenue. Territorial bodies get only about 5 percent. A great deal of dissatisfaction has been caused by decisions recently adopted by the USSR Government which, on the one hand, permit the development of foreign economic activity but, on the other, introduce rigid centralization and licensing, which sharply restricts even border trade.

Very important government documents and normative acts on these matters are being adopted without the republics' consent. I believe that the part of the output which is the property of the republic must be at the disposal of the republic's Council of Ministers. It, after all, issues the licenses. The republics must also keep all foreign currency proceeds generated by the republic—proceeds from tourism, for example, trade activity, joint ventures, and so forth. We must also establish fair normatives, based on world practice, with regard to foreign currency payments for freight transit via the republic's ports and the processing of petrochemical and ordinary freight. The absence of such payments does not make it possible to maintain freight transit routes and ports at the appropriate technical standard, leads to their irresponsible technical and ecological operation, and holds back the social sphere.

We ask the new government to abolish and revise both obsolete and new normative acts and instructions on the basis of the republics' transition to economic accountability and self-financing, including foreign currency self-financing.

The country's new economic mechanism represents various forms of ownership. I support the theory voiced in both reports that the main, decisive point today is the absence of exploitation.

Improving forms of ownership means improving production relations. The role and importance of production relations are demonstrated to some extent by comparing the indicators of agricultural development in Latvia and Finland. In prewar years, the level of agricultural production in Latvia was higher than in Finland. However, in the postwar years the rate of growth in agricultural output in Finland has been considerably higher, while other indicators have been approximately equal. Finland resolved the food problem long ago and the upper level of production is now restricted. I should just add that the average field in Finland is about 15 hectares, and there is no exploitation, nor any category of people such as production organizers of various ranks, of whom there are approximately 4 million in our own country's agro-industrial complex. Evidently we need to more actively adopt world experience and abandon outmoded dogmas in some areas. Yes, we are in favor of a diversity of forms of ownership, of efficiently operating kolkhozes, sovkhozes, agrarian combines, or agrarian firms, but we are also in favor of the peasant as independent producer. I fully go along with the agrarian workers' appeal to the congress. What is more, the country's government must immediately take real measures to stop the exodus of people from the countryside and the dying of villages. Neglected and vacant land should be returned to agricultural production. It is paradoxical that there are millions of hectares of such land in a country where the food problem is still unsolved.

I think it is impossible to solve this problem without allocating extra material, financial, and labor resources. Latvia has adopted a law on peasant farms. Land is allocated to peasants to use in perpetuity. All their property can be inherited. There is now a hope that the land will gain a master. This year alone, there have been approximately 1,000 such masters in our republic. But life is extremely difficult for the peasantry today. In order to set up a normal family farm it is necessary to amass funds—even as much as R100,000—yet at the moment it does not seem possible to provide the peasants with sufficient credit, equipment, and materials. The Union of Latvian Agricultural Workers we have set up has begun to concern itself with protecting the interests of all agricultural workers. This economic organization seriously intends to help the peasantry. However, we are very concerned by what is now happening with purchase prices for agricultural products. It seems that indifferent functionaries intend to stifle even the very latest party decisions on agriculture. For example, with the projected prices, kolkhozes and sovkhozes will have their profits halved next year in comparison with 1988. While all farms in our republic have been profitable since 1983, with the introduction of the new prices one-quarter of them will become unprofitable. Here I would like to refer to the proposal by Deputy Popov, who suggested that debts not be written off. I do not totally agree with this idea and think that the state should write off the debts of bankrupt kolkhozes and also sovkhozes, in other words, of state enterprises. Then the land could be handed over free of debts to a peasant or leaseholder. (Applause).

Comrades! It seems to me that the prices system must be revised and reworked again. The peasants must not be coolly deceived for the umpteenth time. A group of deputies is submitting a question to the government on this matter.

Comrade deputies! We are accumulating a substantial bank of ideas. Along with our activeness, the store of creative, constructive ideas on our country's future is also growing and it seems to me that this is our main capital, this is the future of our country. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is granted to Deputy Marinichev.

Yu.M. Marinichev, chairman of the board of the Moscow Oblast Union of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Consumers' Cooperatives, Moscow Oblast (from the USSR Consumers' Cooperatives): Esteemed comrade deputies! The questions of the Food Program and the problems of the countryside are being raised in trenchant fashion at our congress. For employees of consumers' cooperatives, they are especially close, since we form part of a single whole with the country's agrarian complex. And therefore, we support the appeal of the agrarian deputies concerning the need to radically change our attitude toward the countryside in actual deeds, and not just in words. We apply this appeal to ourselves, as well: A great deal depends on the consumers' cooperatives. And above all, the peasants' everyday life.

The consumers' cooperatives have existed for more than 90 years now in order to meet the interests of rural workers. Of course, the winds of history did not bypass us, either, and tremendous damage was done by the deviation from the true principles of the cooperative movement and the many years of a dogmatic approach to evaluating the role of cooperative ownership. Under the powerful pressure of the administrative-command system, the state assumed control over consumers' cooperatives. Nonetheless, relying on their democratic roots and traditions, they survived and preserved their viability. Today they employ 3.5 million sales clerks, cooks, procurement agents, bakers, and workers in the other common occupations. They provide 27 percent of the total retail trade, serve 40 percent of the country's population, purchase half of the potatoes and a third of the vegetables that become included in state resources, and bake one in every third kilogram of bread. Moreover, they produce nearly R10 billion worth of consumer goods at their enterprises annually.

At the same time, we are very concerned that the great potential inherent in the nature of this form of cooperatives is far from being fully utilized. There are reasons

for that. The cooperatives' vulnerability and many of their problems are attributable to their long-standing, absolute legal defenselessness. Therefore, naturally, we placed great hopes on the promulgation of the Law on Cooperatives. Unfortunately, I must say that it failed to address many vitally important interests of consumers' cooperatives. For example, our system can take practically no advantage of the economic freedoms that the law grants to cooperatives in the sphere of production and services. For all intents and purposes, in both the center and at the local level (and this is since the law was adopted), the attitude toward consumers' cooperatives has remained unchanged. Gosplan, the Ministry of Finance, the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the State Committee on Prices, and other departments continue to try to draw consumers' cooperatives into the system of state regulation and control and to restrict their independence even in the use of their own money. In many decisions and, most importantly, in practical actions, essentially no distinctions are made between state enterprises and consumers' cooperatives. On the other hand, consumers' cooperatives are often confused with the new cooperatives, and the fundamental differences that stem from the social functions that their organizations perform in the countryside are forgotten. For many years, just as today, consumers' cooperatives have painfully experienced a shortage of state attention in matters of material and technical supply. Sales equipment, refrigeration equipment, and production equipment are allocated at a level of 30-50 percent of their requirements. This is seriously holding back any enhancement of the role of consumers' cooperatives in regions' attainment of self-sufficiency with regard to food supply, and in the establishment of relatively small procurement and processing enterprises and shops in every rural rayon. Today the share of rural workers' own resources in their food supply comes to 50 percent, but it could be substantially higher. Complaints regularly come in from the public concerning difficulties in turning in berries, fruits, and vegetables for processing. The situation with regard to the supply of production equipment has become especially acute since the branch that specialized in its production was eliminated, and the process of enlisting defense-industry enterprises in its production has been excessively delayed. While they mainly use their own personnel to build their facilities in the countryside, consumers' cooperative organizations have practically no possibility of buying the necessary construction machinery. In the final analysis, all this negatively affects the provision of services to rural inhabitants.

In our view, one cannot speak of repaying debts to the countryside unless equal conditions are created for rural and urban inhabitants to obtain goods. Given the acute shortage of commodity resources, it is very important to distribute them correctly and fairly. But what do we have in reality? Per capita retail trade turnover in the countryside is lower than in the city by a factor of 2.2.

The procedures for the distribution of resources through organizations of the Ministry of Trade that have developed in unplanned fashion in the country in recent years clearly infringe on the countryside's interests and are resulting in widening the gap in consumption levels between city and countryside. We are trying to find a solution and are increasing the production of goods and foodstuffs at our own enterprises, but our initiative is proving to be punishable. In Russia, for example, in 2 years consumers' cooperatives were deprived of R1.5 billion worth of resources for sale in the countryside. This was exactly the amount by which they had increased the production of similar goods at their own enterprises.

One gets the impression that Gosplan and the other planning agencies are not really supporting the interests of the countryside, and are taking the course of balancing resources on paper without reflecting on the consequences of what they are doing. The USSR Ministry of Trade is stubbornly holding onto its monopoly position in the market. In violation of the Law on the State Enterprise, it dictates to suppliers and customers who should conclude contracts with whom, and who should coordinate their assortment and how, while in practice it interferes with the development of direct ties between consumers' cooperatives and industry. Such a monopoly has not led to any good and will not do so in the future.

I would like to direct some critical remarks toward Comrade Voronin, the chairman of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply. He repeatedly has personally assured the public that the consumers' market would be supplied with timber and building materials. Several government decisions have been adopted on these matters, but the situation not only is not improving, it is becoming even more strained. In Moscow Oblast, for example, the need for commercial wood for the current year has been met by only half. On paper, in the form of unrealistic allocations, the need for standardized houses has been met by 100 percent, but in reality it has been met by only 5 percent. Shortages persist of plumbing products, ceramic tiles, and many other materials. This is especially troubling since solution of the extremely acute social problem of housing depends directly on accomplishment of the task of saturating the market with building materials.

I permit myself to express great apprehension concerning the feasibility of providing every family with a separate apartment or house by the year 2000, if we do not create all the conditions for citizens' widespread participation in the construction of their own individual housing—in both the countryside and the city.

The supply of small-scale machinery for rural workers is extremely unsatisfactory. The process of putting mini-tractors into series production is being dragged out, which is holding back growth in the number of lessees and of individual farmsteads and farms. The state of affairs in the commercial market causes one to reflect on another phenomenon in our life: Many people have

responded to the Law on the State Enterprise from a position of narrow group interests, which have frequently come to dominate over the interests of the country and interests of the people. That is the reason for the washing out of inexpensive goods and the unwillingness to undertake production of items that are needed. A tendency toward the further alienation of producer and consumer has manifested itself. We cannot continue to simply watch while the supply of goods melts away, while whole groups of goods that we had in sufficient supply not just yesterday, but practically always, disappear. I think that we should not begin to shift to a market mechanism for regulating the economy without taking the actual conditions that exist in the state into account. This process should be carefully weighed, gradual, and well thought-out, and it should be accomplished on a step-by-step basis. Before shifting to the new economic relations, it would be useful, in addition to stepping up supervision of the work of trade organizations (which is being done today for good reason), to focus the attention of the public, and also to increase accountability at the state level for the assortment and quality of output produced by enterprises in all branches of the economy.

Comrade deputies! We are exceptionally concerned today by the question of the fairness of taxation of consumers' cooperatives. We pay an income tax on profits. We pay taxes on turnover, taxes on buildings, a land tax, a road tax, taxes on above-plan profits—and we even pay taxes on the part of profits that we allocate for the construction of social facilities in the countryside. Is this sort of taxation policy, which has been in place from time immemorial, rational? Does it suit the state, and most importantly, does it suit rural inhabitants? I think not.

Only 1.7 billion rubles annually is allocated for development of the exceptionally weak physical facilities and equipment of rural trade, while its payments to the budget amount to 3 billion rubles. And that is in a situation in which consumers' cooperatives are the system whose own money, without state participation, largely funds the construction of rural stores, food-service enterprises, and many social and cultural facilities.

One could reconcile oneself to that situation if the money taken from us went for rural needs. Yet, to all intents and purposes, it is transferred, through taxes, from the countryside to the city or channeled into various "projects of the century." Yet everywhere throughout the countryside there is a shortage of trade enterprises, and a considerable number of those that do exist are located in dilapidated, unsuitable buildings. In the 72d year of the Soviet regime about 100,000 rural communities have no stores. After hard work in the fields and livestock sections, people are forced to waste substantial amounts of time searching for basic necessities in cities and rayon centers and at central farmsteads. We ask the government to resolve the question of regularizing and reducing consumers' cooperatives' payments to the state budget in order to thereby increase their contributions to the social development of the countryside.

The further development of consumers' cooperatives' foreign economic ties would help improve the supply of consumer goods to the rural population. They were practically the first in the country to engage in foreign trade, back in the early 1920s. Direct and barter operations have developed especially actively in recent years, when the government has adopted a number of unquestionably correct decrees aimed at decentralizing foreign economic ties.

This is making it possible not only to enrich the assortment of goods for rural localities but also to provide incentives for individuals who sell their agricultural products. However, a number of recent decrees by the USSR Council of Ministers are at odds with those that were previously adopted and once again tend toward the monopolization of foreign economic ties. As a result of this, consumers' cooperative organizations have been deprived of the right to conduct barter operations and have been forced to cancel previously concluded agreements, and even long-term contracts, that are advantageous to us. These restrictions on the part of the state are not in the spirit of the Law on Cooperatives.

Several words about the new cooperatives. Numerous complaints about their work and the lack of public acceptance of many of them are forcing us to draw the conclusion that it is necessary to return to the legal status of those cooperatives and not to let conditions continue that allow the interests of the cooperatives and those of the consumer to become separated. We support those cooperatives that are created for the production of additional goods by using resources other than those intended for sale to the public, and that do not place their personal enrichment above everything else. We favor cooperation with such cooperatives, and we have experience in doing so.

The ideas of the diversity of forms of ownership that have found reflection in the reports and speeches at the congress seem to us to be correct in principle and to be very important for the further development of the country's economy. We see the future of consumers' cooperatives as lying in their self-development and the strengthening of their democratic principles and their ties with shareholders—with sovkhozes, kolkhozes, lessees, and local soviet agencies. This will allow us to increase our real contribution to accomplishing our society's urgent tasks.

The issues that we have raised concerning help from the state are needed not by the consumer cooperatives but by the countryside and the people who plant, plow, and feed us. It is a matter of restoring social justice for them.

We have prepared a draft decree of the USSR Council of Ministers that provides for resolvng the questions of enhancing the role of consumers' cooperatives in the social development of the countryside. What is troubling is that, because of the numerous approvals required (in the spirit of the old times), the decree has not yet come out, and its content is being emasculated. Therefore, the deputies from the consumers' cooperatives have made a

request—we are asking the government to examine the draft that has been submitted and resolve the questions raised in it. In practical terms it is extremely important to create an economically substantiated system of taxation, remove restrictions on foreign economic activity, and finally solve the problems of the state's providing real in matters of material and technical supply. In this connection, we would ask Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, to receive a group of deputies from the cnsumers' cooperatives to discuss these matters.

Comrade deputies! In comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report we heard an analysis of the processes taking place in the country, candid admissions of errors that have been made, and a program of actions in the economic and social sphere that takes the actual situation and potential into account. This permits us to hope that the new government, relying on the positive and negative experience that has been gained in the first years of restructuring, and generalizing a number of interesting and unconventional proposals by people's deputies, will work out the sort of program of actions that will have a real impact on improving the country's economy.

Evidently, the discussions at the congress are drawing to a close. In returning home or getting down to work in the USSR Supreme Soviet, we should concert our efforts on deepening the restructuring processes. And in this responsible mission, we should always remember the supreme trust that the people has placed in us. Allow me to wish everyone success in performing his duties as a deputy. Thank you for the attention. (Applause).

A. I. Lukyanov: Comrades, we have received fairly many notes from deputies requesting that we announce the whole list of speakers. Altogether, 781 people have submitted requests to speak in the debates, and notes from another 11 people have just been given to me. For your information, I want to report that 96 deputies have spoken in the debates on the reports "On the Basic Guidelines of the USSR's Domestic and Foreign Policy" and "On the Program of Anticipated Activities of the USSR Government," and during the congress as a whole more than 500 deputies, which is practically one in every four congress participants, has spoken. If we follow the procedures that we stipulated 2 days ago for concluding the congress, we must evidently heed those deputies who have sent notes expressing a wish to close debate (here are those notes), and give the floor only to those who have specific proposals regarding the congress's draft resolution, for 3-5 minutes. (Deputy Bobritskiiy and others have written this).

Therefore, I should evidently put the question of closing debate to a vote. I want to remind you that according to our provisional rules of order, the closure of debate is done by a decision of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies made by no less than a two-thirds majority of the people's deputies. Therefore, whoever is in favor of closing debate on the report on the Basic Guidelines for the country's domestic and foreign policy and on the government's program of anticipated activities, I ask you to raise your credentials. Please lower them. Opposed? I ask for a count. (A vote count is taken.)

A.G. Kostenyuk: Esteemed deputies, 290 deputies voted against the motion.

A.I. Lukyanov: Who obstained? I ask for a count. (A vote count is taken).

A.G. Kostenyuk: 36 deputies obstained.

A.I. Lukyanov: This morning 2,131 deputies registered at the congress. Thus, by a majority of more than two-thirds, the debate on the reports is closed. In accordance with the congress's provisional rules of order, the texts of speeches by dpeuties who have been unable to speak in connection with the closure of debate may be included, by decision of the congress, in the stenographic record of the sessions. I am grateful to Deputy Ananyev and other deputies who are turning over their speeches to be included in the stenographic record of the congress. Are there no objections, comrades?

From the hall: No.

A. I. Lukyanov: It is agreed. The floor is granted to Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, for concluding remarks and answers to questions.

(The concluding remarks of N.I. Ryzhkov are published on pages 2 and 3.). [The translation of the Moscow Television Service in Russian 9 June live broadcast of Ryzhkov's closing speech appeared in the 12 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT Supplement on pages 43-46]

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades! During the break a meeting will be held of the congress's editorial committee. Members of the editorial committee are requested to gather during this break in the Hall of Facets.

A second announcement. The committee for investigating the circumstances connected with events in Tbilisi is meeting during this break in the room of the congress Secretariat on the second floor.

And finally, the committee for inspecting materials connected with the work of the USSR Procuracy's investigative group headed by T.Kh. Gdlyan is meeting now in the editorial committee's room.

A 30-minute break is announced.

(Break).

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies! The floor is granted to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. (Applause).

(M.S. Gorbachev's concluding remarks are published on pages 1 and 2.) [The translation of the Moscow Television Service in Russian 9 June live broadcast of Gorbachev's closing speech appeared in the 12 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT Supplement on pages 46-54]

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies, the editorial committee has prepared the draft resolution of the Congress of People's Deputies "On the Basic Guidelines of the USSR's Domestic and Foreign Policy." The floor is granted to Deputy Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, chairman of the editorial committee.

V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow City, (from the CPSU): Comrade deputies! The editorial commission you elected, which comprises 68 people representing all social strata of our society and all republics, has worked intensively these past few days and submits for your examination a draft congress resolution on the basic guidelines for Soviet domestic and foreign policy.

Four plenary sittings of the commission were held during the work. The working group worked virtually constantly throughout this time. We made no preliminary drafts, it is all the fruit of the work of the editorial commission—from the first line to the last.

The question of the nature of the document arose from the outset. Various viewpoints were voiced on this score. It was proposed, in particular, to impart to the document the nature of a congress declaration. This was also mentioned in certain deputies' speeches at the congress itself. On the other hand, the viewpoint was also expressed that the resolution, our document, should be purely pragmatic and should only generalize the concrete proposals made in the course of the congress' work. As a result of the exchange of opinions and—and this is the main thing—as a result of practical work we in the editorial commission drew the conclusion that the document should constitute a synthesis, that is, it should incorporate the sum total of the political conclusions, assessments of the situation within the country, and formulas defining the directives for our future domestic and foreign policy.

At the same time it must also be quite specific, contain a practical solution of a number of problems, and provide the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers, and other organs with instructions for the elaboration and adoption of decisions on numerous questions.

The structure of the resolution was also determined on the basis of this premise. It begins with a preamble proclaiming that the Congress of People's Deputies assumes full supreme state power within the country. Thus it responds to the proposals from a number of deputies that the congress should adopt a declaration on this score. The first section of the draft provides a harsh but realistic assessment of the persisting difficult situation within the country, an assessment based on the report and deputies' speeches. The roots of this situation lie in the accumulated deformations and distortions of past periods and the inconsistency and sometimes even halfheartedness of recent measures, which have not as yet enabled the country to emerge from the crisis in which it found itself in the early 1980's. The commission was unanimous that the account of our state's domestic policy should begin with a detailed social program that would provide an integral account of questions linked with the material prosperity, spiritual development, and moral health of society and each of its members. In turn the social program has been set out, as I believe you have seen for yourselves, in such a way that the most pressing and topical questions in need of immediate solution are brought to the fore. They include questions of normalizing the market and easing the position of the least well-off strata of our society. Subsequent sections are devoted to our state's policy in the economic sphere, in the sphere of state and legal building, and in the sphere of national relations, and lastly, to international policy. The document ends with a conclusion whose leitmotiv is the unification of all strata of our people around the party in order to implement restructuring and raise our country to modern levels of socioeconomic development. We were guided by the basic provisions of Comrade M.S.Gorbachev's report "On the Basic Guidelines for the USSR's Domestic and Foreign Policy" and Comrade N.I.Ryzhkov's report "On the Program for the Upcoming Activity of the USSR Government," and also by the theses voiced at the congress from this platform by people's deputies. The commission analyzed the vast number of proposals and comments voiced here. All in all, 702 proposals and questions relating to specific problems were registered, including 72 on changes and additions to the constitution, 309 on socioeconomic problems, 87 on improving current legislation, 83 on interethnic relations, 18 on enhancing the role and prestige of the soviets and stepping up their real sovereignty, 19 on organization and on strengthening discipline, legality, and law and order, and 18 on monitoring accountable organs. They were all carefully systematized and a considerable number of them have been taken into consideration in the draft. Of course, some proposals and comments have not been reflected in this document either because they are too specific or because they require further study and discussion. They will all be handed over for further examination by the Supreme Soviet, its commissions, the government, and other state and public organs. The draft, comrades, also systematizes appeals from individual groups of deputies on various topical problems, including the appeal from a group of deputies from the agrarian sector, appeals on various problems of interethnic relations, and others that are reflected in the draft and proposed for your attention.

I would like to stress—to conclude these brief explanations—that the commission's work took place in an atmosphere of lively and sometimes quite keen debate and comparison of opinions and viewpoints. In this respect it continued the congress' work and reflected its spirit. There were debates on both general questions and specific questions like investment policy, leasing, the role of republic and local organs in solving social problems, the restructuring of the financial and credit system, and so on. By and large the debates were conducted in a constructive spirit, and the document which has been submitted to you emerged as a result.

Comrades, since this document was distributed new questions have appeared in our work and some omissions from the document have emerged. So permit me first to report on proposals from the editorial commission itself regarding additions and changes to the text. May I? **A.I. Lukyanov**: Yes, please do.

V.A. Medvedev: It is proposed to make obvious changes on page 3. At the beginning it alludes to the report by Comrade Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is proposed to also include a reference to the report made by Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers. "Statement" is a more accurate word for the report delivered by the chairman of the Council of Ministers on the program for the USSR Government's upcoming activity.

At the end of the first section it is proposed to include a paragraph instructing the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers to analyze and generalize all the specific proposals made by deputies on economic, social, and other questions, take them into consideration in legislative work and in the practical activity of ministries and departments, and present people's deputies with a report on this. I believe that this should not arouse irritation.

On this same page, in accordance with the clarification made in Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov's closing speech today, it is proposed to include the following clarification in the fifth paragraph from the bottom: "Lift restrictions for pensioned workers and skilled workers." (Noise in the auditorium).

M.S. Gorbachev: Could you repeat that?

V.A. Medvedev: Fifth paragraph from the bottom: "Lift restrictions on labor remuneration for pensioned workers and skilled workers irrespective of the size of the pension they receive." (Noise in the auditorium). The proposal from the Council of Ministers is formulated exactly as it now sounds. As for other questions, the next page mentions the need to elaborate a law on pensions in general. (Noise in the auditorium).

The following proposal is submitted with regard to the text on page 7, second paragraph from the bottom. This paragraph says: "The congress on the whole approves the proposals set out in the reports (minor amendment here) by Comrades M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov to improve the national economy, drastically reduce the budget deficit, regulate money circulation, and saturate the consumer market with goods and services and demands...." Now there is an addition in view of the proposals voiced by people's deputies: "...that additional steps be taken to stabilize the country's economic situation." The speeches yesterday and today from this platform also contain proposals. They should also be taken into consideration when solving these problems.

I ask you to turn to page 8. The third paragraph from the top, which begins with the words: "Seek additional resources to develop the economy and resolve social tasks by reducing military spending to the level of reasonable sufficiency." It is proposed to delete the words which follow—"and expenditure on space programs." And to say instead: "...increasing the effectiveness of space research, making broad use..., "thereafter following the text: "...in the national economy of the achievements of space technology."

The third paragraph from the bottom, which begins with the words: "The congress deems it necessary to devote particular attention to the development of agriculture and all sectors of the agro-industrial complex." The following is to be inserted after this: "The USSR Supreme Soviet is instructed to substantially renew legislation on the land and land use." It goes on: "It is necessary to embark more boldly on transferring land to the lease...." Thereafter it follows the text.

Page 10. Fourth section. The words from the second paragraph "form a commission to prepare a new USSR Constitution..." should be moved to the previous paragraph, which will thus begin as follows: "The congress advocates unanimously that work begin immediately on preparing a new constitution—the fundamental law of the USSR." It goes on: "The congress resolves to form a commission to prepare a new USSR Constitution." Then it says: "The congress proceeds on the premise that the new constitution should embody the principles..."—thereafter following the text. The penultimate paragraph should be worded as follows: "The USSR Supreme Soviet is instructed to prepare amendments to the current constitution by the next session of the congress of People's Deputies..."—thereafter following the text.

I ask you to turn to page 12. The second paragraph, which ends with the words "concerning a unified tax system," should be supplemented with the following sentence: "The USSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers must examine proposals from the Estonian and Lithuanian SSR's on the economic independence of these union republics and their transfer to republic economic accountability as of 1 January 1990." This proposal was submitted to the congress and requires attention.

Fifth paragraph from the top. After the words "the congress instructs" the words "the Constitutional Oversight Committee" should be omitted. They should be replaced with the words: "the USSR Supreme Soviet to examine the question of the consonance with the USSR Constitution..."—thereafter following the text.

Page 13. Third paragraph from the bottom. Add the following words to the middle of the paragraph: "The congress instructs the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities and the supreme soviets of the appropriate republics to examine the question of measures to normalize the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, the proposal to restore the rights of the Volga Germans, the Crimean Tatars, and the Meskhetian Turks, and the development problems of small ethnic groups raised at the congress." (Noise in the auditorium).

I ask you to turn to page 14. The penultimate paragraph. If you swap the last and penultimate sentences in this paragraph it will end with the words: "The withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan was a most important foreign policy step in recent years." The following sentence should be added to this paragraph: "The congress calls on parliaments and the international public to do everything possible to promote the return of the Soviet soldiers and officers who failed to return from the Afghan war and who are languishing in foreign lands."

Page 15, first paragraph. Before the last sentence of the paragraph, after the sentence "In such conditions ensuring the reliable defense of the country is one of our state's most important functions," the following sentence is to be inserted: "The congress advocates the further qualitative development of the Soviet Army, which is raised in the spirit of patriotism, closely linked with the entire Soviet people, and devoted to their interests." Then would come the final sentence: "Concern must continue to be shown for the Soviet Army and for enhancing its prestige."

There is one more proposal with regard to the text of this page. Second paragraph. End of this paragraph, three lines from the bottom. After the words "in the Asia-Pacific region," the gerundive clause "devoting particular attention to friendly relations with India" should be added.

Those are the additions that the editorial commission is making to its own draft.

A.I. Lukyanov: Are there any questions for Comrade Medvedev? There are questions? Please. Comrades, let us agree on how to conduct our work further. Perhaps that is what we should do now. I think that that this draft resolution with the amendments that have been entered should be taken as a basis. What do you think? Can we take it as a basis? And secondly, if anyone has any arguments against taking it as a basis, I ask him to speak up. Is there anyone who wants to speak up against taking this draft as a basis?

Voices from the hall. No.

A.I. Lukyanov: Then I ask you to vote. Whoever is for taking the draft as a basis, I ask you to vote. Opposed? I request a count. This is a serious matter.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Esteemed deputies, nine deputies voted "no."

A.I. Lukyanov: Who abstained? I request a count.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Forty deputies obstained.

A.I. Lukyanov: Thus, comrades, by majority vote the draft resolution of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies "On the Basic Guidelines of the USSR's Domestic and Foreign Policy" is taken as a basis.

Before declaring a break, I want to say that 29 notes have been received with requests to speak on the draft resolution. They are very diverse. In some notes comrades propose absolutely specific wordings to enter into the draft, which makes it possible for the editorial committee to work on the basis of such notes. Others ask to speak. From my viewpoint, Deputy N.A. Shibik took the best approach: He entered all of his amendments on the printed draft. It is very easy to work with such a document. I think that if anyone proposes his amendments in that form he will make our common, concerted work much easier. (Applause).

I would like to announce that deputies interested in the work of the Ecology Committee are asked to remain here in the hall after the end of this session.

A break is announced until 1600.

M. S. Gorbachev, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, presiding.

M. S. Gorbachev: Esteemed comrades! As we have agreed, a group of deputies has handed in texts containing their criticisms. We have turned them over to the editorial committee for action on the ideas expressed in the drafts. Now we have to agree on another matter. There are already about 30 who have signed up to speak. According to our rules of order, three minutes is allotted for that. Thus, we already need more than an hour for this. But as I understand it, once comrades have signed up, their requests are not to be withdrawn. Let us grant the floor, according to the rules, for up to three minutes, comrades, whether a speaker has finished or not. Many comrades have conveyed their criticisms to the editorial committee, and it is acting on them.

Let us continue our work. The floor is granted to Deputy Grigoriy Nikolayevich Podberezskiy.

G. N. Podberezskiy, director of Large-Panel Housing Construction Plant No 2 of the 50th Anniversary of the USSR Minsk Industrial Housing Construction Production Association (Minsk-Frunze National Territorial Election District): Esteemed deputies! I want to dwell on the following matter. If there is one thing we have plenty of in our country, as they say, it is controllers. There is state control, people's control, and worker control. If you try to count, you probably won't have enough fingers. I shall cite just one example—state acceptance. To be honest, I do not know what learned person thought that up. I am a builder. In Minsk we spend 1 million rubles a year and 700,000 rubles in wages on state acceptance. One can figure out how many pensions we could pay, and how we could help families that are not well-off. And there are no results, because the materials that come in are no good. I believe that instead of these controllers, there should be one controller—the Soviet ruble. If it hits people in the pocket, that means that the control will also be obvious. Therefore, I propose that the USSR Supreme Soviet prepare the question of unified control in the Soviet Union for the next congress. (Applause).

And a second matter, comrades. People in Belorussia are actively preparing for the shift to regional cost accounting as of 1 January 1990. But for some reason

today we heard in the draft that only the Baltic republics will make the shift. I ask for an explanation.

A third matter. I carefully read the draft decree. It is written there that we should create a new Constitution. Is it possible that we have created enough new Constitutions? Let us bring the old one up to par, make amendments in it, and accept it at the next congress. That is all I have. Thank you. (Applause).

M. S. Gorbachev: The floor is granted to Deputy Ternyuk. Deputy Zaslavskiy is next.

N. E. Ternyuk: deputy chief technologist at the Plant imini Malyshev Production Association (Kharkov-Ordzhonikidze Territorial Election District, Ukrainian SSR): Esteemed comrades! We have very many laws that are very easy for executives to carry out. And the higher the executive's rank, the easier it is. For a worker, ordinary engineer, or economist, it is sometimes difficult to exercise his rights and take advantage of his possibilities, and sometimes difficult even to defend his honor and dignity. Therefore, I propose that the following be included on page 10, in the next-to-last paragraph: "The new draft Constitution must include mechanisms for the exercise of basic rights and freedoms that will guarantee equal possibility for exercising them to all of the USSR's citizens." This pertains to Articles 14, 18, 20, 21, 40 and others where this issue must be noted and resolved.

Furthermore, an economic system of economic management is impossible without a statewide information system; therefore, I believe that an addition must be made on page 9, third paragraph from the bottom, stating the need to establish a statewide information system.

Comrades, plant workers will go away dissatisfied with this draft, because it contains practically no specific decisions on granting enterprises broad rights and possibilities. Therefore, I propose that the following matter be considered—page 10, before the third paragraph from the top: "The congress deems it necessary that the USSR Council of Ministers revoke the planning system based on gross indices. The Supreme Soviet, together with the USSR Council of Ministers, is charged with drawing up, on a priority basis, a set of laws regulating the economic and economic-management relations of enterprises among themselves, as well as between ministries and enterprises, in order to eliminate diktat."

Furthermore, the following words should be added to page 6, third paragraph from the top: "The production of medical equipment is to be given the status of the production of priority consumer goods, with provision for the appropriate material and technical supply." Our enterprises have the possibility of helping, and it must be done.

I believe that we should express ourselves more specifically with regard to cooperatives that engage in speculation. Therefore, I propose the following addition on page 9, fourth paragraph from the bottom: "to order local soviets to promptly halt the operations of cooperatives in which direct or indirect speculation takes place."

On page six, before the fifth paragraph, an additional point must be included with regard to instructions to the Council of Ministers regarding the implementation of social programs: "To work out a program for granting a 24-day vacation to workers." This is a serious question of social justice. On the same page, fifth paragraph from the top: "...including by providing for the granting of a three-year leave to mothers for childcare." I realize that that means approximately 18 billion rubles, but this matter must be adopted. Right now such a point can already be adopted, and women's work in child rearing recognized as state business.

M. S. Gorbachev: Deputy Zaslavskiy, please. Comrade Vladimir Nikolayevich Stepanov will be next to speak.

I. I. Zaslavskiy: scientific associate at the Moscow A.N. Kosygin Textile Institute (Oktyabr Territorial Election district, Moscow): Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies! I would like to add a proposal to the resolution connected with the life of disabled people and assistance to the disabled. In general, I had prepared a large, substantial report, but I did not have a chance to present it in the debates, and therefore I cannot provide detailed substantiation. I shall cite only the two basic principles according to which I prepared my proposals.

First, disabled persons must be included to the greatest extent possible in the country's working and social life, so that they can work and earn money to support themselves. That is very important from both a moral standpoint and even a purely economic standpoint.

The second point: We do not have it easy with finances. We can manage to do something to help disabled persons and pensioners, and it is very important that everything allocated is used in optimal fashion. Proceeding on this premise, I submit the following proposals. On page 5, where mention is made of removing the restrictions on pay for pensioned workers, regardless of the amount of the pensions they receive, I propose to add the words: "and all employed disabled persons," that is, to remove restrictions for pensioned workers and all employed disabled persons. (Applause). That, first of all, will be humane. Secondly, a pension in this case compensates a person for the loss of health, since it is harder for him to work than for anyone else. And the reasons for which a disabled person often finds it disadvantageous to work will be removed. That is useful not only for the people who have lost their health, but for our country's economy.

Furthermore, on page 5, following the words "enhancing the physical facilities and equipment of the agroindustrial complex," I propose adding the following entire paragraph: "To work out by 1990 a comprehensive program for the physical, labor, social and psychological rehabilitation of disabled persons, in order that these people can become actively involved in life, and restore, to the extent possible, their ability to work, and in purely psychological terms, receive support." There has long

been talk of this, and proposals have been submitted by the society of disabled persons, but unfortunately, they have not been included in a single state program.

To the following paragraph, on page 6, "To create the necessary social, economic and other prerequisites for improving the starting conditions for the inclusion of young people in independent labor and sociopolitical life," I propose adding: "young people, including the disabled." This pertains to the training system, so that people may acquire a specialty in technicums and higher educational institutions. Special boarding schools must be established in ordinary higher schools. Having acquired a specialty, a disabled person will be able to remove himself from society's books and become an active, full-fledged member of society. At this same place, on the sixth page, following the words, "taking the cost-of-living index into account," I propose adding, as an instruction to the Supreme Soviet: "to draw up a program for improving the sphere of social services provided to pensioners and the disabled on the basis of utilizing progressive economic methods for organizing production, while preserving existing benefits for the pensioners and disabled persons themselves."

Let me explain through an example. The prosthesis industry pursues gross output, and its products are very inconvenient. A disabled person has nowhere to get a different prosthesis, because practically all of them come from one enterprise or another—there is no choice. If there is competition among enterprises, it will be possible to choose the products of one or of another. Social funds will pay for them, and the disabled person will be able to select what he needs. If prostheses are kept cost-free for the disabled, and these enterprises are shifted, say, to leasing arrangements, it will become possible to utilize the money that already exists more efficiently, because right now it is being allocated but not fully used. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M. S. Gorbachev: The floor is granted to Deputy Stepanov. Deputy Shchelkanov will speak next.

V. N. Stepanov, director of the Vidlitskiy State Wild-Animal Farm, Olonetskiy Rayon (Petrozavodsk Territorial Election District, Karelian ASSR): I have the following specific proposals. On the 10th page, the words: "To strengthen the role and increase the independence of the USSR State Bank, to study the question of its place in the economic system. To promote the establishment of cooperative and commercial banks, including republic and regional banks...." I believe that at the present time it is premature and mistaken to promote the development of cooperative and commercial banks. As examples show, in a situation where there is an acute shortage of resources, they are already being allocated, unfortunately, to cooperative and commercial banks. And they, in turn, offer them to enterprises and organizations at a higher interest rate than special banks offer. This primarily hurts agricultural enterprises and light-industry enterprises, and throught them—the buyer of their products. Relationships between these banks and the budget have not yet been established. And finally, lacking their own bank personnel, since there is a shortage of them, the cooperative and commercial banks will bleed the USSR state banks and special banks and their divisions by offering them different wages. Therefore, I believe that it is premature to adopt the point regarding the establishment of new banks, and that it must be postponed until the time when we adopt the Law on USSR Banks and when the Council on Economic Development gives us proposals.

To continue, page 11, the following proposition: "In the sociopolitical and economic life of citizens, public organizations, cooperatives and enterprises, the following general legal principle should be consistently established: 'everything that is not prohibited by law is permitted.'" In my view, this expression somewhat distorts our idea—the moral idea of socialism and communism, especially since not everything is in order with regard to our laws, as we have already said here. I would propose a different expression: "The actions of all citizens, organizations, enterprises, and cooperatives should be directed toward improving the well-being of our people, excluding the slightest exploitation of man by man."

Furthermore, on that same page, at the bottom: All of us together here have talked a great deal about the role of the local soviets. But the last proposition cancels out any sort of minimal rights of our soviets and proposes participation, so to speak, in various movements only thorugh public organizations and citizens' initiative. I propose to include the following proposition: "No ministries or departments have the right to be introduced in a territory without taking the opinion of the territory's residents into account."

And finally, at the Supreme Soviet session Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Smolentsev expressed the view, when he was asked about trial by jury, that in general it has not justified itself, and that it is being rejected even in the capitalist countries. That is a very serious statement. Should we introduce trial by jury through a decision of the congress? Thank you.

M. S. Gorbachev: The floor is granted to Deputy Shchelkanov. Deputy Burltskiy is next.

A. A. Shchelkanov, loader at Store No 20 of the Leningrad Berezka Trading Firm (Kirov Territorial Election District, Leningrad): Comrade Deputies! I did not get the chance to speak, and therefore my proposals will be somewhat on the order of theses. There is no time, so I will have to make them that way.

Fifth page, first paragraph: "The congress orders the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers it forms to draw up on an alternative basis and present for consideration by the following congress a detailed program of restructuring with specification of the basic areas, priorities and stages, and with dates and the criteria used in drafting." Extensive work with the public has shown that people do not even know at what stage we are, and have no notion of what lies behind and

what lies ahead, and therefore potential is falling off sharply. A second aspect. On that same fifth page, where we propose raising the amounts of pensions. The wording of the first two points on raising does not cover a whole range of the population, for example, those who receive pensions for the loss of a breadwinner who has not been in the military. We have a huge number of people who receive pensions of 28-34 rubles. In particular, the letter of Galina Yevgenyevna Masova is about that. Therefore, I propose the wording: "To seek out funds for raising the minimum pensions and allowances of all citizens who are unable to work because of health or old age to 75 rubles." In order that all people be covered here and that we do not once again have doubts as to the humane nature of socialism.

Another point. Sixth page, in the middle: "to give increased attention to the participants in and veterans of war, and participants in the war in Afghanistan." I propose including: "internationalist military personnel." This spectrum is broader; it does not yet include but should include, in particular, military personnel who took part in events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and in Damanskiy in 1969.

To continue, I beg the pardon of economists, but at the beginning of the third section on page 7, in connection with the fact that it was stated several times during the speeches and discussions that we have no economic concept, I propose ending the second paragraph in the third section on the seventh page with the words: "economic state of the country." And to add before the third paragraph: "To convene an open congress of economists before 1 September for the purpose of working out alternative guidelines for the country's economic development. The alternative variants are to be proposed for consideration by the Supreme Soviet and approval by the congress."

Two more general points. In the fourth section on the 10th page, we speak of the transfer of power to the soviets. In connection with the fact that Mikhail Sergeyevich's speech today contained a sentence about whether society needed the party, I propose the following addition at the end of the second section of that paragraph: "Over the course of 1989 to hold a broad nationwide discussion (or debate) concerning the role and place of the CPSU in present-day socialist society, to be concluded with a referendum." On page 11, third paragraph from the top, second and third lines. I consider it necessary to clarify: "the human rights to life, freedoms (in the plural, not "freedom"), the inviolability and security of the person, and housing." Thank you.

M. S. Gorbachev: The floor is granted to Comrade Burlatskiy. Next is Comrade Minasbekyan.

F. M. Burlatskiy, political commentator for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, Moscow (from the Soviet Peace Fund, jointly with eight Soviet committees advocating peace, solidarity and international cooperation): Comrade deputies! I would first of all like to express regrets that the problems of the development of the political reform have been inadequately discussed by us at the congress. I hope that this will be done more thoroughly at the next session.

Now for specific proposals. On page 3, where the purposes of our development are discussed, the formula "to give socialism present-day forms" is used. The party documents from the 19th Party Conference and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech at the UN contain what in my view are better and fundamentally more important characteristics: to carry out the transition from state bureaucratic forms and methods to a democratic, humane, civil socialist society.

On page 11, where human rights are mentioned, a reference is made to the Vienna meeting, which is very important. I propose adding a reference to the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Act on the basis of the principle of the priority of the norms of interantional law over national norms, which was also stated in a decree of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Commiitee.

And finally, on page 14, where Afghanistan is discussed. I propose adding the following characterization to this provision: "To order the USSR Supreme Soviet to draw up guarantees against the repetition of such actions in the future." Thank you for your attention.

M. S. Gorbachev: The floor is granted to Deputy Mikhail Sergeyevich Minasbekyan. Next will be Comrade Mikhail Nikiforovich Poltoranin.

From the hall: Is a point of order possible?

M. S. Gorbachev: We are following the rules of order; the comrades are even cutting their remarks, and they are acting correctly.

From the hall: No, I wanted to make a criticism.

M. S. Minasbekyan, first secretary of the Yerevan Gorkom [city party committee] of the Armenian Communist Party (Yerevan-Ordzhonikidze National Territorial Election District, Armenian SSR): Esteemed comrade chairman! Esteemed comrade people's deputies! I want to make a number of proposals. The first concerns Nagorno-Karabakh. This problem has already been mentioned more than once here. But what is the reason that it is still not being solved? In my view, until the very concept used in considering important problems pertaining to practically the entire population of the oblast is changed, those problems will not be fully solved. The point is that attempts are still being made to solve them without the active participation of the people of Karabakh, and it should be just the other way around. If our goal is democracy, and if that is not simply a declaration, we must boldly undertake implementation of the right to self-determination.

In his report, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, speaking about the acuteness of the nationality question, stressed

that restructuring is creating the conditions for correcting any mistakes and deformations committed in the past. So let us give the people of Karabakh the opportunity to correct them themselves, and to determine their destiny. That will make it possible to stabilize the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh and create confidence that the principles of justice are being restored in our country.

Second, the following will unquestionably contribute to stabilization of the situation. At present the correct course of eliminating the blank spots in history has been adopted in the country. It is important not just to state facts but also to give them a fitting evaluation. It is known that in Western Armenia in 1915 Ottoman Turkey destroyed and deported about 1.5 million Armenians. Therefore, I propose that the congress recognize and condemn that fact as genocide. I am certain that if this had been done earlier a great deal of what is negative that has already been discussed here might never have happened. However, even now it is not too late. There is no statute of limitations for crimes against humanity.

Third, as you know, the democratization of our society has evoked an unprecedented upsurge of social activeness among the people, which of course, requires the utmost support and direction into a constructive channel. Therefore, among many problems I would single out the need to promptly adopt a Law on Voluntary Societies and Associations, that is, on nonformal organizations, which have sprung up in our republic and, evidently, throughout the entire country. Because of the lack of legal regulation and, let us say frankly, the unusualness of their emergence, noticeable difficulties are arising in their relations with bodies of authority. Yet many nonformal organizations support the positions of restructuring, and a prejudiced attitude toward them can only drive them away. And here, obviously, there should be only one optimal path—that is the path of dialogue and the consolidation of all progressive forces.

And finally, in the fifth section, where it is stated that justice has not yet been restored with regard to a number of nationalities, "nations and nationalities" should be written, since it is true that justice has not been restored everywhere. Thank you.

M. S. Gorbachev: The floor is granted to Deputy Poltoranin.

From the hall: I still have something to say about the procedures being followed.

M. S. Gorbachev: Fine, Comrade Poltoranin will now speak, and you....

M. N. Poltoranin, political commentator for the NOVOSTI Press Agency, Moscow (from the USSR Journalists' Union): This resolution contains a series of what I would say are illogical propositions. Take, for example, the words on the fourth page: "the positive trends that developed in the economy are being reduced to naught by the disorganization of the financial system, the imbalance of the market, and the increase in shortages of many goods...," and so forth. Since there are shortages, and shortages are growing, and the market is out of balance, evidently there is hardly any reason for speaking of positive changes in this proposition. I would make certain amendments here; I will convey them to the secretariat.

A second point: Unfortunately, in the entire resolution we do not mention the word "glasnost." And here on page 7, the second paragraph, I would propose the following alteration: "...cannot be achieved without a decisive upswing in culture and without a deepening of glasnost," and so forth. In general, incidentally, since we have spoken here about the Law on the Press, and we know that such a law—or more accurately, draft law—has been prepared in the CPSU Central Committee for publication, we journalist deputies (there are more than 50 of us here at the congress), would ask that an alternative draft of the law, which we have given to the secretariat, be published. And a final point concerning this draft resolution. Attention has already been called here to page 5, the first paragraph, where the congress instructs the Supreme Soviet "to take exhaustive measures." There are a lot of generalities here. I propose to edit these words to read as follows: "The congress instructs the Supreme Soviet to draw up a program for the dismantling of the administrative-command system and creation of stable structures for the self-organization of society. The program is to be based on the radical ideas expressed in the report of the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet and in deputies' speeches. In the political part of the program, first and foremost, mechanisms are to be worked out for the democratization of power, that is, the transfer of power to the soviets and their governing agencies, and the stages of this process and to be specified. To this end, the legal codification of the leading role of the CPSU that is stipulated in Article 6 of the Constitution is to be carried out within the framework of the Law on Public Organizations. That law should separate the jurisdications of the political and state authorities. The Supreme Soviet will present the draft program for first reading at the autumn session of the congress. The document is to be adopted following nationwide public discussion." Thank you for your attention.

M. S. Gorbachev: Comrade Grigoryan, please—shall Comrade Dmitriyev go first?

N. G. Dmitriyev, acting chairman of the Presidium of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences' Division for the RSFSR Nechernozem Zone, director of the All-Union Research Institute for the Breeding and Genetics of Agricultural Animals, Leningrad (from the V.I. Lenin All Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences): Since not a single proposal that is being submitted orally or in writing today is being voted on, it makes no sense to continue submitting proposals. The Presidium will decide. And since that is the case, the proposals ought to be turned over to the Presidium and we should end the matter at that. (Applause).

M. S. Gorbachev: Esteemed deputies! This idea was also included in our announcement and invitation before the break. And some of the comrades took advantage of that and turned their proposals in to the Presidum. Nonetheless, we clarified the situation during the break, and the comrades nonetheless consider it necessary to set forth their ideas before the congress. But since a proposal has been made, let us return to the point of departure.

At first, I will tell you this. Evidently, our process of drawing up this document will proceed further as follows: In one form or another we will express ideas and additions—changes in either wording or substance. And the editorial committee is supposed to continue its work over the course of several days together with the Presidium. The editorial committee—absolutely, together with the Presidium. If such a decision is made, following that work of the editorial committee and Presidium, the draft can be distributed to the deputies in order for them all to look it over and voice their views one more time. Those are the sort of options we have.

I am then returning to an old proosal, comrades, which the deputy from Leningrad has repeated, in order to give this process a more organized and efficient character. So, we can hear out speeches before the congress, or we can ask all the comrades to put their ideas in writing and turn them in for work. I call for a vote on the proposal from the deputy from Leningrad. Let us decide right now, comrades. (Commotion in the hall). So some of the deputies are insisting. Therefore, I will nonetheless put the proposal that has been made to a vote. Who is in favor of having ideas, criticisms, editorial corrections, and additions turned over to the editorial committee and Presidium for further work on the draft in written form—I ask you to raise your credentials. Opposed? Put them down. Abstentions? The absolute, overwhelming majority favors the option of submitting additions, criticisms and ideas in written form. Therefore, I ask all the comrades who insisted on speaking to support us all the same and agree.

Good. Now we should decide: Do we assign the job of producing the final document to the editorial committee and the Presidium, or should the draft be distributed to the deputies after work on it is finished? (Commotion in the hall). Distribute it. Fine, we have agreed, comrades. I see that the deputies are disposed to look at the final version. We then will set a deadline, to keep this process from dragging out. Fine, we have finished with this issue.

Yes, Comrade Grigoryan, you speak, since I announced you.

A. G. Grigoryan, architect, chairman of the board of the Armenian Architects' Union (from the USSR Architects' Union): I asked the floor for a point of information. Esteemed comrade chairman, esteemed comrade deputies! Permit me first to provide a point of information concerning the speech of Deputy Suleymenov from Kazakhstan, who said, in part, that in the difficult days for Armenia following the tragic earthquake, a plane carrying military personnel flying from Baku suffered a crash in the disaster zone, and who added that the memory of those who perished remains only in the memory of their mothers.

During those days a plane flying to us from Yugoslavia also crashed. The republic press wrote about these tragedies repeatedly, and with a sense of deep distress. And from the very first days, mountains of eternally living flowers were put up at the site of the death of people who had rushed to Armenia's aid. During those days a collection of money for the construction of monuments to the dead was begun throughout all Armenia, and a competition was announced for designs for the monuments. A decree of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and republic Council of Ministers was adopted on these matters. And there is no need to rekindle passions without knowing the real state of affairs. Especially since gratitude is a characteristic trait of the Armenian people, who have experienced too much grief in their tragic history not to understand their neighbor's grief, especially in these days of planetwide sharing of our grief.

And if the deputy who spoke was not pursuing other goals, why didn't he come up to us before his speech and clarify the facts? And just how can one speak that way about a people that has been dragging corpses from under the ruins for more than a half a year now, a people that precisely with the help of the fraternal peoples is restoring its destroyed hearth today.

I would further like to submit two specific proposals. A great deal has been said here about ecology, and in this sense Armenia, like our entire union, is no exception. I believe that in this connection it is extremely important to introduce into the criminal code articles pertaining to ecological crimes and ecological criminals and providing criminal liability for officials who reduce society's vital resources and the life of people themselves, regardless of the cities in which they live. Otherwise we will accomplish nothing. Let a few people, so to speak, sit for a while and think things over. The ecological situation will only benefit from that, and nature will somewhat recover.

I also want to discuss the role of the intelligentsia in such a fundamentally important and delicate question as internationality relations. We do not mean to condemn the Azerbaijani people for what happened and is happening in the Azerbaijan SSR, particularly for the atrocities of Sumgait. The young people who took to the streets yesterday or today were brought up for decades, and continue to be brought up, unfortunately, on numerous studies, articles and speeches by an intelligentsia that is purposefully poisoning their minds. I think that a resolution of the just demand of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, a demand in which the entire Armenian people joins, could be helped by the establishment of a committee to examine the whole set of issues that have been raised, as specified in the congress's draft resolution. Only that must be carried out without delay.

V.L. Ginzburg, academician and adviser to the directors of the USSR Academy of Sciences' P.N. Lebedev Physics Institute (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): A correct decision was made, I think, as the proposals submitted are not being voted on, to submit them to the Presidium. But I believe that there is a big difference here: The whole country knows those who have spoken and what they have said, but it does not know those who have not spoken. I am not talking about myself, comrades. But I believe that all the proposals that have been submitted and turned over to the Presidium should be published and distributed to the deputies; after all, some things will be included, and some things will not be included.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. Comrade Abasov, please.

M.T. Abasov, director of the Azerbaijan SSR Academy of Sciences' Institute for the Problems of Deep Petroleum and Gas Deposits (Shamkhor Natiional Territorial Election District, Azerbaijan SSR): Esteemed deputies! The situation in Nagorno-Karabakh has been spoken of repeatedly here in the hall. Taking advantage of the fact that many of the people's deputies are inadequately informed about various aspects of the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, certain deputies have been continually trying to create a distorted idea of the essence of the conflict. Attempts are being made to draw us into a fruitless debate over a so-called historical right, primordial ancient lands, and so forth. Where these people want to lead the congress is understandable. I will limit myself to the following consideration. It is typical that the deputies who have spoken here, when recalling the decision on Nagorno-Karabakh, have avoided citing that document in full. Yet it spoke not of removal and not of separation from Armenia, but of the fact that it had been decided to leave Nagorno-Karabakh within Azerbaijan.

Another matter. In his speech Deputy Rasputin spoke with heightened bitterness and offense of how unfair attempts are to heap the blame for the contradictions that have grown aggravated in the country on the Russian people, and to make them to blame for all of our problems. We fully share the writer's feeling and understand his sense of offense. The same sort of situation exists in Azerbaijan. On the whole, the times of stagnation severely affected the social and spiritual state of all peoples. The callous administrative-bureaucratic machine made no distinction as to people's national affiliation, and granted no one advantages and privileges. (Applause).

Some deputies are insisting that the issue of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast be taken up in the congress, and that a commission be set up to investigate the events in Sumgait. But there have also been proposals from deputies from Azerbaijan, who also request that the circumstances leading to the departure of all Azerbaijanis from the Armenian SSR and the death of many people in the process be examined. I believe that these issues are extremely controversial and complex, and that they demand the most serious, thorough and comprehensive study. You understand, of course, that we have something to say in this connection.

M. S. Gorbachev: Comrade Abasov, all....

M. T. Abasov: However, I believe that in the common interest and in the interest of a complete elucidation of the truth, the Presidium's proposal that all these issues be turned over to the appropriate commissions and committees of the Supreme Soviet is correct. And that must be taken up promptly. (Applause).

M. S. Gorbachev: Fine. That is all, comrades! Comrade Ginzburg's proposal. His proposal, too, must be regarded with understanding.

Dear comrades! Since, within the framework of our chief resolution, we have a proposal to establish a Constitutional Commission and proposals concerning its personnel, I should inform you what sort of observations have been made concerning the commission's composition. The delegations from the Ukrainian and Belorussian SSRs proposed making two amendments: from the Ukrainian SSR, it is proposed to introduce Comrade Talanchuk, rector of Kiev Polytechnical Institute, as an additional candidate; and from Belorussia it is proposed to include comrade Platonov, president of the republic's Academy of Sciences, in place of Comrade Tkacheva. Can that be supported, comrades? Let us honor the request of the republics themselves.

Hall: Yes!

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. For the time being, that is for inclusion, and later on we will define matters as a whole. A letter has been received from Deputy Obolenskiy. He writes on the issue of the membership of the Constitutional Commission: "To the first Congress of People's Deputies. Esteemed colleague deputies! I entreat you to include me on the Constitutional Commission...."

Hall: (Commotion).

M.S. Gorbachev: (continuing to read) "...I have long been interested in the issue of improving the Constitution, and I have already sent a number of proposals to the previous Supreme Soviet. I would like to take part directly in preparing the draft of a new version of our country's Basic Law. I ask you not to refuse my request. With esteem, Obolenskiy."

What do you think, comrades?

From the hall: (Commotion).

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine, then let's.... From the noise, I can't tell.... Whoever favors including Comrade Obolenskiy on the list and honoring his request, I ask you to raise your credentials. I ask for a count.

From the floor: Comrade deputies! Nine hundred thirty-four deputies voted "yes."

M.S. Gorbachev: Who is opposed?

From the floor: Nine hundred three voted "no."

M.S. Gorbachev: What does that mean for us? Does it mean that the question of including him has been decided? No?

From the floor: We need to find out who has abstained.

M.S. Gorbachev: Who has abstained?

From the floor: Dear comrades, while the commission is counting, I would like to take advantage....

M.S. Gorbachev: Yes, please.

From the floor: One hundred fourteen deputies abstained. Can we have a clarification?

M.S. Gorbachev: I'll give you one right now. Point 4 of the congress's Provisional Rules of Order, which we approved, states: "USSR Laws and resolutions of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies are adopted at sessions of the congress by a majority of votes of the total number of people's deputies." Thus, the proposal does not pass. (Applause).

Comrades! The group of deputies from Kirghizia is proposing to include Comrade Akayev, vice-president of the Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences, in place of Comrade Orozova. That is the view of the group of deputies from Kirghizia. I think we shall meet their request?

Hall: Yes!

M.S. Gorbachev: And another matter. The deputies' group from the autonomous okrugs submits the following proposal for consideration by the congress: "We ask that one representative of the small nationalities of the North, Deputy Vladimir Vladimirovich Kosygin, Koryak Autonomous Okrug, be included on the commission for drafting the new constitution." Let's honor their request.

Hall: Yes!

M.S. Gorbachev: Are there no objections to this?

Hall: No!

M.S. Gorbachev: No.

From the hall: (Inaudible).

A.I. Lukyanov: We'll have to take a vote.

M.S. Gorbachev: Here we have a request from republics and deputies, and we will make a final decision. Yes, the resolution on establishment of a Consitutional Commission—Since I see no objections, I will not put it to a vote. Although we could vote, comrades.

Hall: No!

M.S. Gorbachev: So far, it is not necessary—Fine, you keep track: We have still not mastered everything, comrades. I take responsibility here. Now we have a request, and first I will give the floor to Comrade Sagdeyev, and then to Comrade Andreyev; he has submitted a note requesting to speak.

R. Z. Sagdeyev, academician, director of the Scientific Methods Center for Analytical Research of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Space Reserch (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): Comrades! I have a proposal to somewhat strengthen the nonparty stratum, if such a thing even exists on the commission, and I hope to significantly strengthen its prestige. I propose including Academician Andrey Dmitriyevvich Sakharov on it.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades! Are there no objections to including him?

From the floor: No!

M. S. Gorbachev: There is no need to vote? No. Later on we will vote on the commission as a whole. Comrade Andreyev.

Yu. E. Andreyev, chief engineer at Mosgiprotrans, the Moscow State Design and Surveying Institute for Transportation Construction, Moscow (Babushkin Territorial Election District, Moscow, RSFSR): Esteemed comrade deputies! Concerning the membership of the Constitutional Commission. I express a lack of confidence in the candidacy of Comrade Aleksandr Sergeyevich Samsonov, based on the position he set forth in his speech. He showed himself today to be a fervent supporter of the methods of the Cultural Revolution in China, which we have condemned. I have in mind his invitation to leading economists to come to his enterprise for reeducation. (Applause). In his place, if a decision has already been made that there should be a director on the Constitutional Commission, I propose a different director—Comrade Mikhail Aleksandrovich Bocharov. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades from Moscow, can you express your attitude? We would like to hear you. I have in mind the proposal to remove the candidacy of comrade Samsonov. I see that no one else is asking for the floor, therefore—You are asking for it? Concerning Samsonov?

From the floor: No.

M.S. Gorbachev: No, we need to settle matters, since there is a disagreement here. Please.

From the floor: Deeply esteemed comrade deputies, Muscovites have sent me numerous telegrams and letters. I have received more than 3,000 of them. They include several letters. What do these letters talk about? "Esteemed people's deputies, we ask you to explain what procedures we can follow to recall Deputy Samsonov as a people's deputy." In the first place, because he proposed carrying out reeducation work, and in the second place, because he proposed establishing a court of deputy's honor. Therefore, although I am not a Muscovite, I also favor his removal. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: No one else will take the floor concerning the candidacy of Comrade Samsonov? That is all. One minute, one minute—The removal is being voted on.

From the floor: Why? You speak, then.

M.S. Gorbachev: Why that?

A.I. Lukyanov: No need.

M.S. Gorbachev: No, comrades, this is the congress's business. I ask you one more time: who from Moscow wants to speak? Please. Take the floor. We will listen to you. Please.

From the floor: I was in Proletarskiy Rayon when Samsonov was elected. I can say that a simply indecent incident happened there. In addition to Samsonov, Nuykin, the writer Pristavkin and Father Yakunin were running from that district. I was Nuykin's representative. As soon as we came in, we were told: "Comrades, that elderly woman over there is about to speak and say that people who do not live in this rayon should be excluded from the voting," although these people were chosen by the rayon. Indeed, that woman rose and spoke. A vote was taken instantly, and Samsonov remained practically the only candidate. That is how the person who has asked here for a "court of honor" got elected. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades! (Commotion in the hall).

From the floor: Esteemed comrade deputies! I would like to say that not a single one of these candidacies has been discussed by the Moscow delegation, the way that the comrades from Belorussia, for example, discussed them. As you know, the Moscow delegation is very large. It comprises a group of deputies from rayons that went through the first and, in some cases, second rounds of voting. And Moscow's huge population of millions stands behind these deputies. People take different attitudes toward the result. Some had different sympathies. And here, when we were coming out of the Palace of Congresses—and I was among those who did not remove their badges—I did not hear a protest against a single candidacy of a Moscow deputy, except concerning Samsonov. I think that this reflects some sort of real situation. Comrade Samsonov was approved by the Credentials Commission, and he is a member of our assembly. In this case there are no questions, but the point is that deputies who enjoy the maximum support of Muscovites should be represented on the Constitutional Commission. In particular, I strongly ask you to support the candidacy of Comrade Bocharov, director of a building materials plant, whom we have elected to the USSR Supreme Soviet. He has worked actively in our editorial commission. I think that Comrade Bocharov will be a useful representative. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Concerning Comrade Samsonov?

From the floor: Comrades! I am a deputy from Kazakhstan. I am not acquainted at all with either Comrade Samsonov or Comrade Bocharov, but I must express my viewpoint, in particular, about Comrade Samsonov.

In discussing various issues in such a democratic forum, we may from time to time find ourselves in the minority. And if his concept of a court of honor is adopted, in the course of five years everyone will be in that court of honor. And it will easily turn into another punitive agency, of which we have no shortage. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Samsonov.

A. S. Samsonov, director of the Moscow S.M. Kirov Clock and Watch Plant, Moscow (Proletarskiy Territorial Election District, RSFSR): Esteemed deputies! I do not know why this question has been brought up today. My candidacy on that commission was not being discussed. Frankly speaking, I never thought that I would serve on it, but it is absolutely clear to me whose this proposal was to raise my candidacy here, in order that I might once more tell about myself and how I became a deputy.

What is the question? The question is that comrades here are carrying on a discussion about the correctness of my election. An esteemed comrade deputy spoke here talking about how some sort of rule had been violated from the standpoint of the election principle. I can report here that during the district meeting and during the elections, I was not in Moscow at all; at the time I was on a business trip abroad. And how everything took place, and how the matter was organized is another question. There is a Credentials Commission, and there is an election commission, which have been given the right to decide this question.

A second proposition. I want to say once again here, and today I can confirm once again, that what I was advocating was not holding any sort of trial of anyone who is absolutely innocent. Today the voters, my voters, who elected me, told me that what ought to be set up is not a court of honor but a commission on ethics. We will work for a few years and will come to this question, because the question is not a simple one. It requires a certain order; it requires a certain discipline. Therefore, I repeat once again: no issues should be distorted, and I firmly support the idea that we should have a certain order. Both in the congress, and in the country. (Applause).

N. T. Knyaznyev, first secretary of the Kustanay Obkom of the Kazakh Communist Party (Kustanay Territorial Election District, Kazakh SSR): Esteemed comrade deputies! I am a member of the Credentials Commission. Twice, and very closely, the Credentials Commission examined the results of the voting for the district where Comrade Samsonov ran. We submitted a decision to recognize Comrade Samsonov's authority, but in the process of our examination, instances of the flagrant violation of the Statute on Elections were discovered. In the process of the elections, there were so many obstructions against Comrade Samsonov that a normal person simply cannot conceive of them. We are serious people

who have gathered, and we are simply wasting our time. I believe that this is a hounding of deputy Samsonov. (Applause).

V.A. Logunov, deputy editor of the newspaper MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, Moscow (Kuntsevskiy Territorial Election District, RSFSR): I am one of those, whom Deputy Adamovich did not name, who was nominated in the Proletarskiy Election District. I was nominated by the Kometa collective, which includes many thousands. I attended that antidemocratic district meeting. In my opinion, there were 17 people there, including the writer Pristavkin, Gleb Yakunin, a retired officer, and me, a deputy editor. Literally in the very first minutes (I do not attribute this to Deputy Samsonov; he really was not at that district meeting), literally in the very first minutes it was announced that all the candidates for deputy who did not work and live in the rayon could leave. And thus, we left. I say this because we should nonetheless return to that period of the preelection campaign and to the district meetings and examine their work, because there were very many violations.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades! Can it be that this is enough?

From the hall: Yes!

M.S. Gorbachev: The picture is clear. Please.

From the floor: Comrade deputies! Since the questiion of Comrade Samsonov's candidacy primarily concerns the Moscow group, since he is in our group, I submit a proposal that the Moscow group vote separately.

From the hall: (Commotion).

From the floor: That is my proposal.

M.S. Gorbachev: Well, can it be that's enough?

Zh.I. Alferov, academician, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences' A.F. Ioffe Physics and Engineering Institute, Leningrad (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): From Comrade Samsonov's speech I understood that he did not intend to serve on the Constitutional Commission. I understood that he was simply withdrawing his own name.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. That's all. I will put the question to a vote. The question of the withdrawal of the candidacy of Comrade Samsonov.

Comrades! I am putting to a vote the withdrawal made by Comrade Samsonov. Whoever is in favor of not including the candidacy of Comrade Samsonov on the membership list for the Constitutional Commission, I ask you to raise your credentials. I ask for a count.

From the floor: Comrade deputies! 555 deputies voted "yes."

M.S. Gorbachev: Who is opposed, opposed to this proposal, opposed to the withdrawal?

From the floor: 1,188 voted "no." (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Who abstained?

From the floor: 101 deputies abstained.

From the floor: Mikhail Sergeyevich, this is a deputy from Kazan.

M.S. Gorbachev: The question is decided. Please. You will be next.

O.P. Borodoin, staff correspondent of the newspaper IZVESTIYA (Yakutsk City National Terriitorial Election District, Yakut ASSR): We made an analysis of the list of candidates for this commission, and it turned out as follows: 17 people are first secretaries of obkoms and of the CPSU Central Committee; another 31 are employees and members of the Central Committee—these are people who have a relation, so to speak, to the top party leadership. Altogether it turns out that we have on this commission 55 percent candidates from the top party leadership, comrades. I have a question. What are getting ready to create: new Party Statutes, or a new Constitution? (Applause). In the second place, no one consulted me in the Yakutsk delegation, either, as to whether Yuriy Nikolayevich Prokopyev, the secretary of the party obkom, ought to be included on this commission. I have nothing against it, but that is also a violation of our democracy. I think that the commission should include people who are endowed with living, vital experience. That is the first point. the second point is that I propose, in general, to create an alternative commission. (Commotion in the hall). And that we have two draft Constitutions, so that we can choose. For the second commission, I propose, first of all, Yevtushenko. He has formulated. (Commotion in the hall). He has already done a fine job of formulating one point for the draft of the new constitution. I have everything.

V.M. Minin, chief of a repair and maintenance shop at the Glebovskiy Poultry Production Association, Kholshcheviki Settlement, Istrinskiy Rayon, Moscow Oblast, RSFSR (from the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League): The voice of the young people has been heard very little at this congress, and that is probably noticeable: we are constantly be included on all the commissions at our request. We request that our comrade Sergey Zvonov, a deputy from the All-Union Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League], be included on this commission. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Well, comrades, what about the request by the deputies from the Komsomol?

Voices: No!

Yu. V. Golik, dean of the Division of Law of Kemerovo State University (Central Territorial Election District, Kemerovo Oblast): Comrades, we are not bound by any sort of quantitative limits in forming this commission; therefore, I propose to include Candidate of Legal Sciences Yuriy Alekseyevich Yevtyukhin, a docent at Kemerovo University, on it. Why him? To all intents

and purposes, as of today he is the only theoretician who specializes in congresses of soviets. We need to develop this form of work, and therefore it would be a good idea to know what we had up until those congresses existed. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, that can be accepted. What do the legal specialists say? Do they support that? I see Comrade Kudryavtsev there, and Comrade Yakovlev. Do they agree with that? No one objects?

L. I. Sukhov, driver at Motor Transport Enterprise No 16301 (Kharkov Territorial Election District, Kharkov Oblast): I actually woke up early today, although I went to bed late, and I was thinking about what we are creating and how. Here we are all the time saying this person is good, and that person is good, but the "good" people have already been running things, and today we are mired down. And I appeal not so much to this hall as to the television viewers: take a look and what awaits us tomorrow if we really do not include on the commissions the people who really are reflecting about what our motherland should be like. I know that commotion will start up in the hall now, and that is also something that brought me here. We do not know how to conduct ourselves. I am a simple driver, but I have not once stamped my feet or shouted in this hall. So how is it you do not want to hear your comrades out? Can you possibly understand what he is talking about? Can you possibly think that your opinion is the only correct one? I also wanted to speak but was afraid that in that way each of us would start pushing his own line. I promised my voters, so I did it. And we should become a single monolith, but through agreements that are not without principle. We should know how to hear out everyone's opinion. And we are not doing that. We shout—let's have it, faster! And what's really putting us in a spot? Here's what. Yesterday we discussed candidacies at 11:30 p.m., when people already wanted to sleep and they were ready to accept anyone, just to have a nomination. That sounded like this: Shcherbitskiy—he was recommended to us. Everything was like it was before—once again, someone had been recommended. Yet it is time, most likely, to get away from that—time! I propose Vlasov and Yevtushenko for the commission. I think that they will at least stimulate its work a bit. Thank you for the attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Andrey Dmitriyevich, just a minute. Let's decide this at the outset, so that things won't build up. Comrades, regarding Comrade Sukhov's proposals. He has proposed putting Comrade Yevtushenko on the commission. How do you view that? (Commotion in the hall). We'll have to vote. Whoever is in favor of supporting Comrade Sukhov's proposal and including Deputy Yevtushenko on the Constitutional Commission, I ask you to raise your credentials. (Vote count is taken).

M.S. Gorbachev: Andrey Dmitriyevich, sit down; I will give you the floor. Please.

A.D. Sakharov, academician, chief scientific associate at the P.N. Lebedev USSR Academy of Sciences' Physics Institute (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): I suspect that on all the fundamental issues that will arise in drafting the text of the constitution, I will be in the minority. That will put me in a difficult position, if it is not agreed upon in advance that the commission is to propose two alternative drafts that will be considered on an equal basis. I think that is very important.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Esteemed deputies! 449 deputies voted "yes."

M.S. Gorbachev: Opposed? A clear majority; there is no point in taking a count. Abstentions, comrades? The question of the candidacy of Comrade Yevtushenko is decided—he is not included. Now for Comrade Vlasov, concerning his inclusion on the commission. Whoever is in favor of accepting Deputy Sukhov's proposal and including Comrade Vlasov on the Constitutional Commission, I ask you to raise your credentials.

(Vote count is taken).

A.G. Kostenyuk: 830 deputies voted "yes."

M.S. Gorbachev: Opposed?

(Vote count is taken).

A.G. Kostenyuk: 934 deputies voted "no." (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Abstentions? Well, okay. Comrade Vlasov's candidacy does not pass. (Applause).

M. A. Mikheyev, leader of an all-purpose brigade with the Uglestroy-1 [Coal Construction-1] Construction Administration, Neryungri (Neryungri National Territorial Election District, Yakut ASSR): Comrade deputies! I am speaking on the matter that Deputy Borodin brought up here. He seemingly expressed a lack of trust in the party—the secretaries of the oblast party committees and the Central Committee. I fundamentally disagree with him. He said that these people supposedly do not know life. I will say two words in defense of my obkom party secretary Prokopyev. I am a Communist, a worker and a builder, and I have known him for a long time, since before he served as obkom secretary. I know how much he has done for the republic, and therefore I support Prokopyev's candidacy. Thank you. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, may I announce? Please.

From the floor: Comrades, we have voted on the candidacies of Yevtushenko, Vlasov, and Obolenskiy. Let us also vote on each candidate on the list. That would be normal. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: The congress will decide that. So, comrades, with that we can consider that we have concluded the discussion. I remind you that the Ukraine and Belorussia have submitted changes; you remember,

I announced them. Additions: to add Comrades Yevtyukhin, Sergey Zvonov from the Komsomol, Academician Sakharov and Akhayev. So we are adding to the list. Now we have a list of the candidates who were submitted (you have that list in your hands) and the comrades who are being added. So we must actually make a decision concerning the formation of the commission in the membership that has been presented. Before putting the adoption of this decision to a vote, I must, as we have agreed, consider the proposals of the comrades who have spoken here. Should we vote on them individually?

Individually. As you know, in this case the congress determines by majority whether to vote on them individually or as a list. Since a proposal has been received from Deputy Kirillov to vote on them individually, I ask whoever is in favor of his proposal to raise your credentials. I ask you to lower them. Opposed? I think that it is not just a majority but an overwhelming majority. The question is decided. Therefore, I submit a proposal: Whoever is in favor of adopting the resolution on the formation of the Constitutional Commission in the membership on which we have agreed, I ask you to raise your credentials. I ask you to lower them. Opposed? Count, please.

(Vote count is taken).

A.G. Kostenyuk: 106 deputies voted "no."

M.S. Gorbachev: Abstentions?

A.G. Kostenyuk: 94 deputies abstained.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine, the question is decided, comrades. The decision on the formation of the Constitutional Commission has been adopted.

Dear comrades! Yesterday evening we did not fully decide one issue—the issue of the Constitutional Oversight Committee. In order to get out of the situation that arose among us—and we are all witnesses to it—we had to conduct discussions yesterday evening. And this morning I met with the deputies from Lithuania on this matter. We had the same sort of discussions, and proposals also came in from the deputies from Estonia.

The following proposal is made, and I ask you to support it. It is this: to form a commission on the preparation of a draft Law on the Constitutional Oversight Committee in the USSR. (Applause).

For this purpose it is proposed to include the following comrades on this commission: A. Akayev, vice-president of the Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences (the Urals, Sverdlovsk; you have heard his speeches); V.G. Badamyants, chairman of the Armenian SSR State Security Committee; T.P. Buachidze, chairman of the Georgian Culture Foundation; Yu.V. Golik, dean of the Division of Law at Kemerovo State University; I.N. Gryazin, a department head at the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law; G.I. Yeremey, chairman of the Moldavian Republic Council of Trade Unions; Yu.Kh. Kalmykov, head of a division at D.I. Kurskiy Saratov Institute of Law; D.A. Kerimov, head of a department at the CPSU Central Committee's Academy of Social Sciences; G.K. Kryuchkov, first secretary of the Odessa Obkom of the Ukrainian Communist Party; V.N. Kudryavtsev, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; S.Kh. Negmatulloyev, president of the Tajik SSR Academy; O. Ovezgeldyyev, president of the Turkmen SSR Academy of Sciences; A.S. Pavlov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee's Department of State and Law; Z.K. Rustamov, member of the Syr-Darya Oblast Court, Uzbek SSR; V.I. Semenko, chairman of the Ivanovo Oblast Court; V.Ya. Skudra, Latvian SSR Minister of Justice; A.Yu. Smaylis, head of a laboratory at the Z. Yanushkyavichus Research Institute for the Physiology and Pathology of the Cardiovascular System, Lithuania; A.A. Sobchak, a department head in the Division of Law at Leningrad State University; U.M. Sultangazin, president of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences; A.Ya. Sukharev, USSR procurator general; G.S. Tarnavskiy, Belorussian SSR procurator; A.M. Yakovlev, sector head at the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of State and Law. Okay?

Deputies: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Can we put it to a vote?

Deputies: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Whoever is in favor of forming this commission with this membership, I ask you to raise your credentials. I ask you to lower them. Are there any opposed? Count, please.

A.G. Kostyenyuk: Comrade deputies! 10 deputies voted "no."

M.S. Gorbachev: Abstentions?

A.G. Kostenyuk: 25 deputies abstained.

M.S. Gorbachev: The question is decided. Now, comrades, we have to consult with you. We on the Presidium, foreseeing such a course of development and the limitations on our time, drew up a proposal: to take a 30-minute break right now (we still have 15 minutes until 1800), and then hold debates on questions of "other business" until 2000. You have probably picked up on the fact that the problems of "other business" that have been put forward by deputies have turned into the main question. And we have several important questions. Two hours will be enough for us, since these matters of "other business" incorporate many proposals by deputies. And on that we could then conclude the congress's work. What about it, comrades? A 30-minute break.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades! Before going on to the next question, there is something we must agree on. I think that it is perfectly natural and in the deputies' interest. In order that a situation does not develop in which we have left seemingly without having concluded our work by adopting the main document and without having voted on the entire document. In order to take that document as a basis, we have already voted for the main things in

it, which were prepared and were taken into account in the process, and have adopted them. Nonetheless, we are feeling uncomfortable and sensing some sort of delicate situation. So, if we asked you about the following. Let's vote for the resolution as a whole with instructions to the Presidium and the commission to work out the final wording of that resolution. As it turns out, so let it be.

If you are of that opinion, deputies, you can decide that way. And you can, as I have said. To be precise: We already have adopted the main basis, and a lot of additions, a great many; in the course of a week we could carry out the whole process and work out the final wording of the document in the Presidium commission and, at the end of that week, distribute the new draft, finally worded in accordance with the deputies observations, to the deputies, and receive your consent. And that means that sometime in about a week, 10 days at the most, because it is a large resolution encompassing all the fundamental issues, it would be published.

Thus, there can be two options. Either we stand with the version on which we have agreed, so that no later than within 10 days that resolution will be completed and published, but with the requirement that deputies be informed, without fail, of its final version. Or we can adopt different instruction.

So we are in favor of voting for the resolution as a whole and instructing the Editorial Commission and the Presidium to take the proposals that have been made into account to the greatest extent possible and, upon the completion of that work, publish it?

Yu.Yu. Boldyrev, senior engineer at the Central Research Institute for Ship Electronics and Technology, Leningrad (Moscow Territorial Election District, Leningrad): Comrades! I call your attention to the fact that we cannot and should not turn the authority to decide something for us over to the Editorial Commission, according to its status. The Editorial Commission is a purely staff body that is supposed to offer us only versions, and we should vote on the proposals that we submit. Therefore, I submit a third proposal, which in my view is the only normal one: The principal controversial proposals must be put to a vote. Otherwise, it will not be the resolution of the congress; it will be only the resolution of the Editorial Commission. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: And so, from this third version it follows—extend the work of the congress. No, I am saying that about the first option. And Comrade Boldyrev's proposal, as I understand it, is that the work of the congress must be continued. Is that right, Comrade Boldyrev? He just did not carry the idea through, and I always carry things through so they will be clear. So, continue the work of the congress until a decision is made?

So, three proposals.

The first proposal, which we discussed in the previous session. Whoever is in favor of acting in the manner on which we agreed, with the clarification that the document should be published no later than in 10 days, I ask you to raise your credentials.

What, it's not understandable? The first proposal, on which we agreed: Instruct the commission and the Presidium to work out the final wording of the text and distribute it to the deputies, and do all this in such a way that the resolution is published within 10 days, and no later. That is the proposal on which I am asking you to vote. I ask you to lower your credentials. Who is opposed? Perhaps we should count? It's a fundamental question.

M.S. Gorbachev: Andrey Dmitriyevich asks me to say that when the comrades receive the final draft with observations, and all the additions are expressed in it, that each deputy could express his opinion individually on each change. Fine. We are agreed. Please.

From the floor: Esteemed deputies, 121 deputies voted "no."

M.S. Gorbachev: Are there any comrades who abstained? In my opinion, no. No, there are. Comrades, while a count is being taken I want to say that the deputies are still of the following mind: That which we have now already discussed and taken as a basis, there is a proposal to vote for that or consider that those provisions have been adopted.

From the floor: We have voted. The basis has already been adopted.

M.S. Gorbachev: Therefore, the option about which we agreed remains. We will be given the figures in just a minute, but the question, in principle, has been decided.

From the floor: Will all proposals be received?

M.S. Gorbachev: Absolutely. But you have in mind that there will be identical proposals. We have already brought them to light here, during yesterday's work, and last night. There are a great many duplications and overlappings.

From the floor: 32 deputies abstained.

M.S. Gorbachev: The question is decided.

Comrades, now for a brief word of introduction concerning the point on the agenda known as "Other Business," I give the floor to Comrade Lukyanov. He will speak on behalf of the Presidium, since we have discussed this matter two or three times.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies! During the preparations for the congress and in the course of its work, delegations from republics and regions, and people's deputies submitted proposals to examine a whole series of issues at the congress that were not on the preliminary agenda. Therefore, as you recall, at the first session of the congress a decision was made to add the point "Other Business" to the agenda.

The congress Presidium examined all these proposals very closely, and more than 20 of them were received. These questions were looked at three times in the congress Presidium before any sort of conclusion was reached.

It must be said, first of all, that many of the proposals have already been decided in the congress in one form or another. Many questions that the deputies have raised have been acted on. Thus, in what we have adopted, by and large, as a basis for the resolution "On the Basic Guidelines of Foreign and Domestic Policy," appropriate instructins have been given to the Supreme Soviet, the government and other bodies on a whole series of questions pertaining to the implementation of economic reform and the development of the social sphere, and provisions have been made for a radical renewal of legislation on the soviets of peoples deputies and for strenghtening the foundations of the rule-of-law state.

The preamble incorporates proposals that it was proposed to draw up in the form of a decree of the congress. The resolution reflects, in particular, deputies' proposals concerning the need to check on the conformity of certain ukases of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the Constitution, and that has also been expressed in a specific point in our resolution.

Substantial attention has been given to matters that were connected with proposals from the republics. In particular, they are reflected in our basic resolution, and evidently it will be necessary to decide whether to set up a special commission on this matter. I am referring to regional cost accounting and to carrying out the reform in the republics.

In connection with deputies' request that changes and additions be made in the existing Constitution and a new Constitution drawn up, as you know, today a Constitutional Commission has been formed that has been instructed to carefully study all the issues that the deputies raised and make appropriate proposals. You also know that commissions to work out a political and legal evaluation of the 1939 Soviet-German nonaggression treaty, to investigate the circumstances connected with events in Tbilisi, to investigate materials connected with the work of the USSR Procuracy's investigative group headed by T.Kh. Gdlyan, and other commissions have been formed by the congress and are already functioning.

Taking what has been said into account, the congress Presidium, after long discussion, reached the conclusion that under "Other Business" the following matters could be examined, taking the proposals from deputies and delegations into account. First, the question of preparing a draft Law on the Status of USSR People's Deputies. You know that proposals on this were expressed in the speeches of many USSR People's Deputies. Some deputies submitted proposals in written form—for example, Deputies K.D. Lubenchenko, A.F. Nazarenko, Yu.A. Koltsov and A.Ye. Sebentsov presented their ideas in the form of whole drafts of a USSR Law on the Status of USSR People's Deputies. That has already been mentioned here. As you know, the principal rights and duties of USSR people's deputies are established by the existing Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR. But many norms in that law can already be applied and implemented, since they are not contrary to the new provisions of the Constitution and apply to all deputies and all representative bodies of state authority. This pertains to such institutions as deputy's immunity, the ties between deputies and constituents, the deputy's request for information, the right of legislative initiative, and a number of other provisions of that law. At the same time, USSR People's Deputies rightfully raise the question of the need to draft a new Law on the Status, and the Presidium fully agrees with that. That law, and it must be drawn up, should strengthen the guarantees of the rights of people's deputies, clarify the legal bases of deputies' relations with bodies of state authority and administration, and deal in detail with all matters connected with the implementation and exercise of deputies' powers.

Taking that into account, a draft resolution of the congress has been submitted for your consideration and will be distributed to you in advance; it proposes that the USSR Supreme Soviet be instructed to prepare a draft USSR Law on the Status of People's Deputies with a view to its adoption at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies to be held at the end of this year.

The resolution also proposes that certain additional norms be established right now, for the transitional period, so to speak, until the new law is adopted. These norms are aimed at creating conditions in which people's deputies can effectively carry out their deputy's activities right away. The resolution refers, in particular, to the provision of appropriate materials to deputies, and to deputies' priority right to speak and write in the mass media, and it provides that a deputy may have a secretary paid out of funds from the estimated expenses of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Deputies, and this is also stated in the draft resolution, should be provided with the space necessary for performance of their deputy's duties. It is established that officials are subject to disciplinary penalties up to and including dismissal for failure to fulfill their duties with regard to USSR people's deputies.

Naturally, the norms that are concentrated in the draft that has been distributed to you are norms of a temporary nature, until the next USSR Congress of People's Deputies adopts a new law on the deputies' status, which will be drawn up by the Supreme Soviet and presented for your consideration at the next congress. Moreover, it is natural that these temporary norms will be appropriately further refined, evidently taking into account the experience that we gain.

I have spoken with many comrades, and they have already submitted certain of their ideas concerning this draft, and I think that their ideas are justifiable. The only

thing that is needed is for our law to gradually grow with the practice of the 2,250 USSR People's Deputies elected to our congress.

You have the draft congress decree on the preparation of a draft law on the deputies' status, and I hope that you have had the opportunity to become acquainted with it.

Now a second question. A substantial number of deputies' proposals for items to be included under "Other Business" on the agenda were connected with the need to draw up laws that are required to support the active work of our congress, as well as of the Supreme Soviet, committees, commissons and, in general, each people's deputy. Thorough work is required here, as it is on the law on the status. In this connection, the Presidium proposes that, after discussion, a resolution be adopted concerning this issue on the preparation of several draft laws regulating the procedures for the activities of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the Supreme Soviet, and its bodies. The draft of this resolution has been distributed to you. It calls for giving instructions to the Supreme Soviet to draw up and submit for consideration by the second congress draft regulations of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, a Law on the Compensation of USSR Congress of People's Deputies for Expenses Associated With Deputy's Activities, and a Law on Procedures for Recalling USSR People's Deputies. In this regard, we have only a Law on the Procedures for Recalling a Deputy of the Supreme Soviet, and there are as yet no such procedures for a deputy who is a USSR People's Deputy.

As for (and there was another law there, and you have seen it) as for the preparation of a draft Law on USSR Constitutional Oversight, we could give such an instruction to a commission that we created specially today. We gave it today. Therefore, this draft law obviously should not be included in the general resolution on instructions to the Supreme Soviet and in the drafts that it is to prepare. Although today some comrades submitted a rather interesting proposal that a program of legislative work be drawn up. And that proposal has also been reported to the deputies. In my opinion, it is a useful undertaking. And in addition, in the course of our debates a number of deputies expressed the idea that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies address a Message to the World's Peoples in which we could set forth our attitude toward restructuring and the principles of our foreign policy. So there are three major questions that could be considered in the section of our work on the agenda that consists of "Other Business."

I would like to emphasize one more time that all the remaining questions that we have considered in the Presidium with great thoroughness have in one way or another found reflection in the congress's main resolution, including a number of decisions concerning the nationalities question, with mention of certain painful knots that exist in our country with regard to the resolution of nationality relations.

So there is a proposal that the congress Presidium has instructed me to bring to your attention.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades! There are all the proposals that the Presidium is submitting for discussion at this session of ours. A question? Please.

From the hall: We have received a draft Law on Taxation, but when will that be?

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades! You received several draft laws today: on taxation, on inventions, etc. Some of them have been put in finished form with due regard to their discussion by the public, and some have not yet been put in finished form. We believed that the deputies should receive these draft laws in their hands, as we agreed, so that you would know what lay ahead and what the Supreme Soviet would be doing. They are the drafts that will go for consideration by the Supreme Soviet and its commissions. There is not yet any need to consider them at the congress.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

A.Ye. Antifeyev, general dierctor of the Tyazhmash [Heavy Machinery] Production Association (Ilyichevskiy Territorial Election District, Donetsk Oblast): During the debates certain deputies proposed that the editor in chief of the newspaper IZVESTIYA be elected at the congress. A mass of telegrams came in from my constituents; I got 28 of them. I do not know about others, whether they support that proposal, but I would like this question also to be taken up under "Other Business" on the agenda. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades! Please. An addition to the agenda, right?

Yu.A. Levykhin, scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Spectroscopy, Troitsk (Podpolskiy Territorial Election District, Moscow Oblast): I believe that we could also consider at the congress the question of rescinding Article 11 of the 8 April ukase. I think that it has already been adequately worded and, to all intents and purposes, has been expressed in the resolution itself. Therefore, I think that we can adopt such decisions now. That is not just my opinion but the opinion of the people who signed the appeal on this subject. I propose that this question be decided right now as a legislative initiative. (Applause).

B.N. Nikolskiy, editor in chief of the magazine NEVA, Leningrad (Smolniy Territorial Election Distrrict, Leningrad): Back before the congress, the Leningrad group of deputies proposed that the question be included on the agenda of establishing a commission to investigate all the circumstances leading to the involvement of the Soviet Armed Forces in the war in Afghanistan. The course of the congress has shown that this question continues to be timely. One of the most dramatic moments in the congress arose over precisely the discussion of this problem. Therefore we Leningrad people's deputies submit the following proposal. I think that it will be

difficult for the congress to set up a commission right now, and therefore I propose a draft of the following resolution: "To instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet to establish a commission to investigate and evaluate the circumstances that led to the Soviet Armed Forces' participation in the war in Afghanistan. (Applause).

V.A. Martirosyan, colonel, commander of a military unit, Carpathian Military District, Rovno (Rovno Territorial Election District): Mikhail Sergeyevich, by status, many of us deputies have initiative groups and authorized representatives. These are people who gave us a great deal of help during the election campaign. We need these people very much in order to work effectively. That requires that you declare here whether we can use these people's services, and whether they can officially give us assistance. That is the first thing.

Secondly, it has been directed here that space be allocated. I think that the people's deputies, especially those who are unable to receive people at their work places, should be allocated permanent offices, so that representatives of their initiative groups can sit there along with the people's deputies, because the people have an exceptionally large number of requests and very many urgent questions that need to be resolved. In particular, I have four rayons, and in each one of them space should also be allocated, since I should be there with an initiative group in each. I think that it would be advisable and simultanesouly would enhance the authority of our people's deputies. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. Comrades, let us first finish setting the agenda, since discussion and proposals have already begun. Are there any more additions to the agenda?

A.G. Zhuravlev, professor at the Republic Interbranch Institute for the Advanced Training of Executives and Specialists, Minsk (Minsk-Soviet Territorial Election District, Minsk Oblast): I propose that the question of changes that need to be made in the Law on Elections be included under "Other Business" on the agenda. Many of us have personally experienced all the shortcomings of that law. We are presently approaching elections to local soviets. And there are at least some points of the existing law that we have no right to leave unchanged. In particular, I would propose changing at least one point (we have the right to do that) by vote. It is the point on district election commissions. (Applause).

In addition, I believe that we should express ourselves absolutely clearly as to the impermissibility of substituting open voting for elections. We should clearly go on record as saying that elections without a choice of candidates are impermissible.

And finally, third and last. We could, in this connection, discuss the question of what is preventing us, in general, from holding elections where a choice of candidates is offered. I think that one shortcoming and one reason for this is that we lack such experience at the bottom. It seems to me that we are presently prepared, at least in many regions of our country, to begin electing the principal leaders of regions on the basis of a choice of candidates through direct secret balloting among the entire population. That is all I have to say. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Sobchak.

A.A. Sobchak, department head in the Division of Law at Leningrad State University, Leningrad (Vasileostrovskiy Territorial Election District, Leningrad): Comrade deputies! In the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA for this 2 June a number of USSR People's Deputies- -Comrades Batynskaya, Yemelyanov and Sokolov—reminded us of events in Novocherkassk in 1962. In connection with these events, seven people received death sentences, and a substantial number of people were sentenced to various terms of deprivation of freedom. I propose that we include on the agenda under "Other Business" a resolution of the congress instructing the USSR Procurator General to protest that judicial decision and take steps to rehabilitate the persons involved (Applause).

A.L. Plotnikov, foreman at the Kirovo-Chepetsk Repair and Maintenance Shop, Kirov Oblast (from the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League): Comrades! During the time the congress has been in session we deputies have frequently met with Moscow's young people. There are permanent telephone hookups connecting us with our people back home. By way of carrying out our constituents' directives, in light of the positive reaction our hall gave the proposal made in Yuriy Vlasov's speech, and also taking into account the immense importance of the offices of chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting and the editor in chief of the newspaper IZVESTIYA, we support the proposal that has been made here and propose that that question be included on the agenda under "Other Business." I think that step would be a concrete contribution by the congress to the development and irreversibility of the processes of the democratization of our mass media. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Please, please.

I.A. Andreyeva, chief art specialist at the All-Union House of Garment Patterns, and secretary of the board of the USSR Designers' Union, Moscow (from the USSR Designers' Union): I have several questions and proposals. How will we find out about the plans, the questions discussed, and in general, the agenda of the Supreme Soviet?

M.S. Gorbachev: We will send out....

I.A. Andreyeva: So that the possibility exists, I am asking not so much about myself, because we are in Moscow. But what about people outside of Moscow?

M.S. Gorbachev: We will send out materials. And more than that: so that the deputies will know about the plans for the work of commissions and committees, and not just the congress.

I.A. Andreyeva: Yes, yes. So that we can exercise our right. Secondly, we have never finished discussing questions pertaining to the state of affairs with regard to the 8 April ukase, the Law on Internal Troops, and other recent legislative acts that raised doubts and apprehensions among many deputies concerning their application. Therefore, I have the following proposal. I would like to include it on the agenda, raising for discussion under "Other Business" the possibility of the application of these laws until their wording is changed. And at the same time, raising the question of the deadlines for changes to be made in their wording, and of applying these laws and the ukase only with the authorization of the USSR Supreme Soviet or the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

Thirdly, I consider it necessary, in confirmation of what Anatoliy Ivanovich has just said, to give all the people's deputies a list of the priority draft laws, as Comrade Lukyanov called them, that will be literally knocking on the door, in order that the people's deputies can determine their order of priority, and that that order of priority serve as the foundation for the Supreme Soviet's work.

And finally, I believe that under "Other Business" we must, at the end of the agenda (deputies have just handed me this request), allocate time for announcements and statements by deputies' groups, if deputies' groups or individual deputies have any. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

A.V. Levashev, lecturer in the Department of Political Economy at Leningrad Soviet Leningrad Technological Institute Leningrad, Pushkin (Kolpinskiy Territorial Election District, Leningrad): On behalf of more than 130 people's deputies, by way of carrying out numerous directives from our constituents, and on the basis of Article 114 of our USSR Constitution, as a legislative initiative we submit for consideration of the congress a draft resolution aimed at improving the material situation of the low-income segments of the population. We request that this resolution be submitted and examined under "Other Business."

M.S. Gorbachev: I do not understand. About what?

A.V. Levashev: A resolution on improving the situation of low- income segments.

I.B. Shamshev, senior instructor at Yaroslavl State University, Yaroslavl (Leninskiy Territorial election District, Yaroslavly Oblast): Comrades, I support the Leningrad deputies' proposal to discuss the question of the Afghan war, but in a slightly different form. I think that what we should be talking about here is not a comission, since we are not, say, talking about Tbilisi, where about 19 people died and several hundred people were wounded. In this case, tens of thousands, or even millions, of people died (about a million Afghans died), and here what we need is not a commission but to hold an open hearing in the USSR Supreme Soviet on the development, course and results of that war. To identify the people who were to blame for launching it, and present a report of the Supreme Soviet to the second USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Moreover, I think that the congress should perhaps go ahead today and discuss that war, which was started on the basis of the decision of a narrow circle of the country's leaders and waged illegally, contrary to the Constitution of the USSR and without the sanction of the Supreme Soviet. In addition, I think that we should adopt a decision to the effect that the congress categorically forbids the sending of contingents of USSR Armed Forces beyond the borders of the USSR without the discussion of this matter in the USSR Supreme Soviet and the adoption of a decision by a two-thirds majority in a roll-call vote. (Applause).

V.I. Kirillov, senior scientific associate at Voronezh Polytechnical Institute, Voronezh (Leninskiy Territorial Election District, Voronezh Oblast): We are constantly talking about imminent ecological disaster. In international practice an effective means of preventing such a disaster is to hold regional referendums. My colleague Deputy Sokolov from Voronezh and I have directives from my voters demanding that we absolutely establish procedures whereby regional referendums are held on ecological problems. I submit a proposal that we adopt a resolution that the holding of regional referendums on ecological problems be put into practice—until the adoption of a Law on Referendums, in connection with the importance and urgency of this task. Thank you.

K.A. Antanavichyus, department head at the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Economics, Vilnius (Vilnius-Oktyabr Territorial Election District, Lithuanian SSR): The deputies have proved indefatigable. I nonetheless think that we must continue to consider the problems of the economic reform. We have submitted for consideration, over the signature of 109 deputies, a draft law on the economic autonomy of republics. There has been no response on this issue. Instead, general principles of the restructuring of the management of the economy and the social sphere, etc. are being proposed to us for consideration. We have already been considering that since the beginning of January, and even earlier. Indeed, this is only the restructuring of the management, and that cannot suit anyone. There is no talk of autonomy here and, most importantly, there is no talk of economic reform, of the reform of economic relations. Relations remain the same—command relations. So I propose that discussion of the draft law on economic autonomy, including the reform of economic relations, be mandatorily included on the agenda. In the first day it was also proposed by Academician Sakharov that a decree titled "All Power to the Soviets" be considered and adopted. I believe that we cannot leave such a question without attention. This is also consonant with the proposal by Deputy Rasputin, who spoke earlier and raised the question of holding a referendum on nuclear power plants. I believe that this question should also be included. Thank you for your attention.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: Please. One minute. On a point of order, we give the floor to Comrade Yanayev—out of turn, since he observes that we have coming up, that, in my opinion, there will be another 20-30 or so people.

G.I. Yanayev, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, Moscow (from the USSR Trade Unions): Excuse me, comrades who are in line, for requesting the floor out of turn on a point of order. Mikhail Sergeyevich, the first question is to you. If my memory does not fail me (and I hope it does not fail me), you said that the time until 0800 would be assigned to the discussion of "Other Business."

M.S. Gorbachev: That's right.

G.I. Yanayev: In that connection, maybe my proposal will help the comrades orient themselves, because we have already put forward so many proposals under "Other Business" that the discussion of each of them will require holding debates for as much time as those that we have already held. Perhaps, my esteemed colleague deputies, we ought to be realists. We think that most of us, if not so long ago, then at least recently, left our youth behind. So let's not put forward proposals in accordance with youthful maximalism. Let's be realists. Perhaps we should limit the discussion to those questions that have already been raised. Thank you. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Just a minute. Let's consider Comrade Yanayev's proposal. His proposal comes down to the following: cut off the list of questions...

From the floor: Mikhail Sergeyevich, but I have already come up to the rostrum.

M.S. Gorbachev: Just a minute. To cut off the list of questions and begin considering whether or not to include on the agenda the proposals that the comrades have made. Is the proposal clear, comrades?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: I put to a vote: Whoever is in favor of adopting that proposal and taking up the question of whether to include the questions that have already been put forward on the agenda, I ask you to vote. I ask you to lower them. Opposed? I ask you to lower them. Abstentions? The list is cut off; the question is decided. Thank you.

From the floor: Mikhail Sergeyevich....

M.S. Gorbachev: No, just a minute. If you are going to speak on a question that has already been included, you take the floor, but now we will go no further. That is all, comrades, that is all.

Now I want to discuss with you what we will leave. Our time is moving on. We have already been working for 55 minutes, and I want to discuss what we will leave on the agenda. The first question—on the status of the deputy. Leave it for discussion?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Good. The second question, on drafting laws that are required for supporting the active work of the congress. They include regulations of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, a law on the compensation of people's deputies for expenses connected with their work as deputies, and a law on the procedures for recalling a USSR People's Deputy. Leave them? Leave them.

The third question concerns appeals. Such a proposal was made back at the beginning of our congress. Now I want to enumerate from memory and notes; although I may not repeat the authors' wording correctly, the essence will be clear. Comrades submitted a proposal that we consider the question of confirming the editor in chief of IZVESTIYA and the director of radio and television. Then to resolve the question of Article 11. There was also discussion at the same time of the ukases. After that came the question of setting up a commission on Afghanistan. The question of services to deputies—offices, and so forth—is covered by the discussion of the status and all that is provided there. Changes in the Law on Elections also need to be discussed—as well as events in Novocherkassk. Time must be set aside for statements. Comrades are submitting a draft resolution on low-income families; they believe that what the government has submitted is inadequate. It has also been proposed that we decide the question of referendums on ecological problems before the law on referendums is adopted. And finally, the question of economic reform. As I understand it, it is an initiative by the Baltic republics and Belorussia. Is that right? Do I understand correctly? So there are these 11 questions. Let's look and see what we will leave for discussion. So there are proposals that the Presidium has made—three of them. And there are questions that the comrades have submitted. I would not hurry, comrades, but all the same give attention to this. There are a lot of substantive questions here.

I do not believe that we have to resolve the question of the newspaper editor and the chairman of the Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting at the congress. One is a member of the government. The other, in essence, will be higher than the government in our country. The government and all the rest are confirmed by the Supreme Soviet, and the editor—by the congress. Here is something that we need to sort out, comrades. I do not think that these questions should be decided in an emotional state. As for establishing a commission on Afghanistan, we could, I would submit the following proposal: to instruct the Supreme Soviet to decide this question and submit proposals, and then we will decide what sort of hearings to hold.

On changes in the Law on Elections. I do not think that we need to open debates at the congress on this matter. We should instruct the Supreme Soviet to take this matter up and prepare a draft law that takes everything into account. This, after all, is very serious, comrades. I

am confident that we should have a better Law on Elections than we had in this election campaign. And the republics, incidentally, are themselves adopting them.

Now time must be allocated for statements. I think that this is already beyond the capabilities of this congress. And as for events in Novocherkassk, I would also turn the question over for consideration by the Supreme Soviet. There remains Article 11.1; I am leaving it separate. Those are the sort of explanations with which I would turn over all these questions for consideration to the Supreme Soviet, listing them in a certain order, and instruct it to resolve these questions. That is how.

If you have been listening closely, and if you have read our basic resolution, it begins with the statement that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies takes power into its hands. That is our basic document.

And so, we are deciding the question of what we will leave on the agenda under "Other Business." So, concerning the first three questions, I would support the proposal that the Presidium submitted: create a commission for the resolution of questions connected with republic cost accounting and economic autonomy—what we have included here in the basic draft, and Belorussia has added to it. To establish a comission for this work. So include those four questions. Consider the question of Article 11.1 right now. And turn over all the remaining questions to the Supreme Soviet with appropriate commentaries and instructions, which I have mentioned. Okay, comrades?

From the hall: Okay.

M.S. Gorbachev: Whoever favors that approach, I ask you to vote. I ask you to lower them. Opposed? Abstentions? Adopted. And so, according to the agenda. On the status of deputies. Please, Comrade Krayko. The rules, I think, allow one or two minutes for observations, comrades.

A.N. Krayko, department chief in a division of the P.I. Baranov Central Institute of Aviation Engine Design Moscow (Bauman Territorial Election District, RSFSR): I ask for three minutes. In the draft that we have here, I propose making the following changes: to replace Article 9, which speaks about the secretary, with the following article: "In order to fulfill his duties as a deputy, a USSR People's Deputy may be released from his principal work and rely on aides who act as his official representatives, as well as on consultants and technical specialists. Their work, as well as mailing expenses, expenses for duplicating documents, etc. are paid for out of the deputy's budget, the upper limit of which is set by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The part of the deputy's budget that is not spent in the current year is returned to the state budget and cannot be spent for deputies' personal needs. In carrying out his work as a deputy, a USSR People's Deputy is provided with transportation. The local soviets provide permanent space, with telelphones, for the work of a people's deputy and his aides."

Now another important point, which has repeatedly been raised here at the congress. It concerns the so-called party-state collision. I recall an incident from the experience of Lenin. At the eighth congress of soviets a preliminary Central Committee decision was adopted on one of the questions, and the deputies asked Vladimir Ilyich what would happen to them if they voted against it. Vladimir Ilyich replied by referring to the Party Statutes. Here is the quote from the Party Statutes: "In questions pertaining to its internal life and current work, the faction is autonomous." Here were Lenin's words: "So, all members of the faction have the right and are obliged to vote according to their consciences, and not according to the Central Committee's instructions."

In accordance with this, I propose to add an additional, 14th point to the draft; it reads as follows: "In the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet, the people's deputy is guided solely by the law, the will of his constituents, and his own convictions, and is autonomous in relation to other state, political and public bodies."

Finally, the first point. In accordance with what I have said, I propose the following wording: "To instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet to prepare a draft of a new Law on the Status of the USSR People's Deputy and to consider it at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the fourth quarter of 1989. In addition to the following, that law should provide for the division of authority among the deputies of soviets of various levels, the right to collective and individual investigation of the actions of state and public organizations and their representatives, the provision of up-to-date information, including the right to use printing and duplicating equipment, and the criminal liability of officials for knowingly providing deputies with false information. The draft law is to be sent to USSR People's Deputies in September 1989."

What I have said is the result of the work of a large group of Moscow deputies. I ask all these points to be put to a vote. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Aleksandr Nikolayevich, how much will your proposal cost?

A.N. Krayko: The problem is, you have set the budget.

A.I. Lukyanov: No, but you say. We have set it, but you.... (Inaudible).

A.N. Krayko: How much our proposal costs depends on the sort of budget we are given. R200 is not enough for us. That's for sure.

M.S. Gorbachev: Just a minute. Perhaps since the proposal is of a carefully considered, fundamental nature, we should consider these questions? But I think that we have a case of jumping the gun here. If we take that path and make decisions that way, I guarantee that we will produce such decisions that afterwards no one will be able to give an accounting for them. If we have discovered that we have many serious shortcomings in the process of preparation and in the adoption of decisions

and their implementation in the past, that approach no longer merits cheers, comrades. I think and am convinced that we should proceed on the basis of the following. We should prepare a good, well- substantiated Law on the Status of the Deputy and submit it to the congress. Moreover, I think, that law should be thoroughly prepared, so that the deputy is given the proper status, and protected, and provided for. I will say bluntly—all those points should be included. (Applause).

Right now, I think, the question is already resolved in the draft. In addition to what already exists in the status of the deputy (since we have some deputies who are members of the Supreme Soviet, and some who are not), in order to preserve the deputy's lofty status, a number of provisions are being added, and they are being codified. Incidentally, for the most part they have been taken from the proposals of Comrade Krayko and his fellow deputies. Only they want to act on the entire draft right now, and we cannot do that just like that. Although I should say that I do not want to reject everything. But to take everything and immediately adopt it right now—Our people will say: Well, look, that way they will squander the country, too. (Applause).

I am certain that the question of the deputy's material situation needs to be resolved without delay, and that he should be provided with transportation, without fail, should have an office for receiving people, and should have a secreatry on a permanent basis. He should receive general information from any agency. So, until there is a law, that will be enough.

Incidentally, transportation does not mean a private car. Transportation costs should be covered.

On this question, comrades, we have two approaches. In my opinion, this is very serious, and we should not look ridiculous before our people. I would put the question this way: everything that requires immediate resolution in order to provide the conditions for deputies' work should be used from these proposals, and all the rest should be used in preparing the draft law. Okay, comrades?

But Comrade Krayko was ahead of me here, and he submitted a proposal. We should either accept his proposal or reject it.

Who is in favor of adopting those proposals right now in their complete form? I ask you to raise your credentials. I ask you to lower them.

Opposed? Essentially the whole congress is opposed, comrade Krayko. But all the same your proposals, I assure you, will be used. Because there is a great deal of value in them.

Please.

A.V. Minzhurenko, department head at Omsk State Pedagogical Institute, Omsk (Central Territorial Election District, Omsk Oblast): I have more modest proposals. And I think that they can be adopted immediately. The point is that in this case I am acting according to precedent. We have now been working for three weeks, comrades. And we have people back home who have addressed their complaints and petitions to us. We, for example, with our authorized representatives, tried to do as follows: I left one of my authorized representatives, a qualified legal specialist with a higher education, a notarized authorization to continue the business that I had not finished when I left for the congress. We acted on our own without yet knowing whether we could do that or not. But it turned out that in some organizations that authorization has been treated with confidence, and he has continued to work, while in others it has not. Therefore, I think that we can establish this right now, without a lot of fuss. Many of us go on business trips and are simply busy people. We could leave notarized authorizations with our authorized representatives, and they could continue our affairs. I think that is not a very complicated matter.

M.S. Gorbachev: Your proposal is clear.

Comrades, I do not know: Either a comrade voluntarily turns over his authority, or we want to have three, four, seven deputies in one district. Comrades, this is a special authority that we receive from the people through an election campaign. It must not be oversimplified; that will not do. That is simply unacceptable. And I do not think that we need to vote here. We should simply explain that.

V.A. Zubanov, secretary of the party committee at the Khartsyzsk Steel Wire and Cable Plant, Khartsyzsk (Makeyevka-Gornyatskoye Territorial Election District, Donetsk Oblast): I have two questions about the work of a people's deputy that, in my opinion, need to be resolved right away.

The first question: I would still like to receive additional explanation of how the work of deputies who are not on a committee, a commission, or the Supreme Soviet but want to have the right to express their views without actually voting will be carried out. The question is this: Who will issue the summons to do so? How will questions concerning that deputy's place of work be resolved? A business assignment, leave from work—how will all these procedural questions be decided? I want Mikhail Sergeyevich to provide some additional explanation of this matter.

The second question has already been raised here: the provision of transportation. We all know that deputies are provided with free travel on transport. But the problem is there are rural rayons where means of transportation run to villages once a day, and sometimes only official vehicles go to them. If you take up such matters, it turns out that a deputy will be busy a whole day just to visit one village. I have three rayons, for example. Each rayon has a party raykom, a rayispolkom, and a rayon Komsomol committee. They all have means of transportation. I believe that, at least for the initial period, until we adopt the Law on the Status of the People's Deputy, the executive committees should provide a vehicle to a people's deputy upon request for various specific needs.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. Comrades, I think that we have already clarified this matter, and I want to say something once again.

First, deputies who work on the Supreme Soviet—on commissions and committees—have rights equal to those of members of the Supreme Soviet who serve on those commissions and committees. Moreover, those who are enlisted in regular work on those commissions will be materially provided for on the same level as regular members of the Supreme Soviet. But all that must be resolved.

Deputies who consider it necessary to take part in the discussion of questions that are of special interest to them will have, as we have already said, information about the meetings of a commission, etc. They will send a telegram to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. On the basis of agreement with the Presidium, they will go. Those who work, including those who work at a machine tool, will be compensated for their average earnings out of the budget. That is mentioned in the status. As for transportation, let us preserve the record as it is. I think that people at the local level will be attentive to the resolution of these questions, since that has been noted by the congress. We will live for these 3 or 4 months, and everything will probably become clear, and then provisions that will resolve all the questions and difficulties that have arisen will be incorporated in the law.

V.A. Shapovalenko, head of a laboratory at the Orenburggazprom [Orenburg Gas Industry] Production Association's Volga-Urals Research and Design Institute for the Extraction and Processing of Hydrogen Sulfide Gases, Orenburg (Orenburg City Election District, Orenburg Oblast): I have a small correction. In point 6, where it lists what a people's deputy has a right to request information about, nothing is said—and it should be said—about the organization of the information that is required to be given to him.

Further, the second paragraph: At the instruction of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies or the Supreme Soviet, public organizations have the right to show documents. But why should I have to ask authorization from the Supreme Soviet or the congress, when I should exercise that right within my district without the Supreme Soviet? Otherwise I won't be allowed at a single trade outlet; people will say: Give us the authorization from the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I believe that that should absolutely be included.

And, I am hurrying, the ninth point: "The USSR People's Deputy has the right to have a secretary." I would propose "assistant-secretary"; one could call it that. I connection with the fact that I still have a whole minute, I will make one announcement.

The first USSR Congress of People's Deputies is concluding. The discussion that has been held at the congress has been unprecedented in candor and has had a strong impact on public attitudes and on the whole internal situation in the country. At the same time, in preparations for holding the congress there was a great deal that left a feeling of dissatisfaction and concern. It seems to us that at the congress we have still not managed to create a mechanism for identifying and comparing points of view and bringing them closer together. Many key problems in the country's life either have not been considered, or have been discussed hastily. A good many valuable proposals have not been noticed or have been rejected without adequate grounds for doing so.

We believe that the chief source of the difficulties the congress has encountered is, in the first place, the lack of adequate advance preparation and, in the second place, the lack of proper mutual understanding among deputies and their inability to discuss and understand alternate points of view. We should draw lessons for the future from this. Taking into account the experience gained by the Moscow club of deputies, who did serious preparatory work just before the congress, as well as the experience of the groups of agrarian deputies and deputies who are Komsomol members, public-education employees and ecologists, who have done a great deal during the congress out of a desire to establish close contacts and mutual understanding among deputies from various regions of the country, and in an effort to create favorable conditions for dialogue and compromise agreements, we announce the establishment of an interregional group of people's deputies. The group's chief purpose is to begin preparations for the next, autumn 1989 congress, and to draw up proposals and draft documents, especially in the following areas—Okay, I'm finishing.

More than 150 deputies have signed this paper.

M.S. Gorbachev: I ask Comrade Lukyanov to formulate our proposal on the question under discussion, which comes from all the deputies.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades! On the eve of the congress we in the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet carefully studied the question of the 8 April ukase. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet believes that in Article 7 of that ukase it could be indicated, to put it bluntly, that public appeals for the violent overthrow of the social and state system established by our constitution are punishable under criminal law. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has carefully studied the question of Article 11.1 and believes it possible to presently propose to the congress that this article be rescinded and simultaneously, if the designation of such a crime is required in the future, that it be examined—and this will evidently be approved by the congress—in the context of ratifying the Basic Principles of Criminal Legislation and the Law on State Crimes. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: But this is a legal point; we must vote, comrades.

S.M. Ryabchenko, head of a laboratory at the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Physics Institute, Kiev (Moscow Territorial Election District, Ukrainian SSR): I would still like to add to Anatoliy Ivanovich's remarks

one small detail. It seems to me that he is correct in saying that the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet deems it possible to rescind the article. But I would like for that to read: "at the insistence of the congress." (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Correct. Only, I think precisely that has been stated, that there is complete understanding and a unanimous position here. Whoever is in favor of the proposal that has been submitted and in favor of the adoption of a resolution on this matter, I ask you to raise your credentials. I ask you to lower them. Opposed? I ask for a count. (A count is taken). Comrades, I ask you immediately to keep in mind that following the close of the congress there will be announcements. Life goes on.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Esteemed deputies, seven voted "no."

M.S. Gorbachev: Abstentions?

A.G. Kostenyuk: Six deputies abstained.

M.S. Gorbachev: The question is decided. A resolution rescinding that article has been adopted. (Applause).

Comrades, I must inform you, because the Presidium and I, we cannot undertake the resolution of such a matter. Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov urgently requests the floor. (Commotion in the hall).

Wait just a minute. We on the Presidium have conferred on this account; we did not have the opportunity to do so in the course of the debates; moreover, it was taken into account that Deputy Sakharov has spoken several times, seven times in all, and we had to take that into account; such was the Presidium's collective opinion, but I must inform you that we have had such a request from Deputy Sakharov; he asks for 15 minutes—(Commotion in the hall).

Comrades, let's determine our will. Will we give him the floor? (Commotion in the hall). Just a minute. It seems to me that we should ask Andrey Dmitriyevich to condense and express his views in 5 minutes. (Commotion in the hall). Just a minute, comrades. There's no need—Here is another request that, for example, the Society of Theater Workers considers it abnormal that, despite insistent requests, Comrade Lavrov has not been allowed to speak once. (Commotion in the hall). So there's our situation. Fine, let's decide the question this way. I submit a compromise proposal: Whoever is in favor of giving Deputy Sakharov 5 minutes for a speech, I ask you to raise your credentials. Must we count? Opposed? A minority, a clear minority. Please, Andrey Dmitriyevich, 5 minutes.

A.D. Sakharov: As it turns out, comrades. It's not always possible. I have not spoken in conceptual terms. I would say that my proposal is, in any event, a little unusual; I recognize that and feel my responsibility for it. Therefore I will speak as I prepared to speak.

Esteemed people's deputies! I am speaking to explain why I voted against the proposed final document, despite the fact that it contains extremely many very important ideas and is extremely useful. But nonetheless, I believe that this document reflects the congress's work, and that the congress did not accomplish its main task—the establishment of power, the establishment of the sort of system of power that would provide for the accomplishment of other tasks—the economic task, the social task, and the task of overcoming ecological madness. The congress elected a chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the first day, without a broad political discussion or at least a symbolic alternative. In my opinion, the congress committed a serious mistake, substantially reducing its ability to influence the formation of the country's policy, and thereby rendering poor service to the elected chairman, as well. According to the existing constitution, the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet possesses absolute, practically unlimited personal power. The concentration of such power in the hands of a single person is extremely dangerous, even if that person is the initiator of restructuring. In saying this, I have the utmost respect for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, but this is not a personal question; it is a political question. Sometime it will be someone else. The construction of the house of state has begun with the roof, which is clearly not the best way to proceed. The same thing was repeated in electing the Supreme Soviet. For the majority of delegations what took place was simply the appointment, followed by the pro forma confirmation by the congress, of people among whom many are unprepared for legislative activity. Members of the Supreme Soviet are supposed to leave their previous jobs "as a rule"; this is the deliberately vague wording whereby they turn out to be "ceremonial generals"—more than 50 percent of them—on the Supreme Soviet. Such a Supreme Soviet will be, one can fear, simply a screen for the real power of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the party and state apparatus.

In the country, under the conditions of an approaching economic disaster and the tragic deterioration of international relations, powerful, dangerous processes are taking place, one manifestation of which is a general crisis of confidence among the people in the country's leadership. If we float downstream consoling ourselves with the hope of gradual changes for the better in the remote future, the growing tension may tear our society apart, with the most tragic consequences.

Comrade deputies! A tremendous historical responsibility rests on you; political decisions are needed; without them it will be impossible to strengthen the power of local soviet agencies and solve economic, social, ecological, and nationality problems. If the USSR Congress of People's Deputies cannot take power into its hands here, there is not the slightest hope that the soviets in the republics, oblasts, rayons, and villages will be able to take it.

M.S. Gorbachev: One minute.

A.D. Sakharov: Without strong local soviets, it will be impossible to carry out land reform and, in general, any

sort of effective agrarian policy that differs from the senseless infusions of money aimed at reviving unprofitable kolkhozes. Further, I will omit my arguments and read the text of a decree on power that I propose we adopt.

Decree on power.

Proceeding from the principles of democracy, the USSR Congress of People's Deputies declares:

1. Article 6 of the USSR Constitution is rescinded.

2. The adoption of USSR laws is the exclusive right of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. On the territory of a union republic, USSR laws acquire legal force following their ratification by the republic's supreme legislative body. (Applause).

3. The USSR Supreme Soviet is the congress's working body. I'll omit a point in order to speed up.

5. The election and recall of the supreme officials of the USSR, to wit, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the chairman of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the chairman and members of the Constitutional Oversight Committee, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, the USSR procurator general, the USSR supreme arbitrator, the chairman of the Central Bank, as well as the chairman of the USSR KGB, the chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and the editor in chief of the newspaper IZVESTIYA, are the exclusive right of the congress. The aforementioned officials are accountable to the congress and independent of the decisions of the CPSU and its agencies.

6. Candidates for the post of deputy—

I am omitting another point. Lastly.

The seventh point. The functions of the KGB are limited to the tasks of protecting the USSR's international security.

I ask that an editorial commission be established and that this decree be taken up at a special session of the congress.

I appeal to the USSR's citizens with a request to support the decree on an individual and collective basis, as they did in the case of the attempt to compromise me and divert attention from responsibility for the Afghan war.

I omit arguments.

I continue. For a long time now there has been no danger of a military attack against the USSR. (Commotion in the hall, applause). We have the largest Army in the world, larger than those of the United States or China taken together. I propose the establishment of a commission for the preparation of a decision on reducing periods of service in the Army by approximately half for privates and sergeants, with corresponding reductions of all types of arms, but with a substantially smaller reduction in the officers' corps and with a view to shifting to a professional army. Such a decision would have tremendous international significance for confidence-building and disarmament, including the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, as well as tremendous economic and social significance.

My speech is of general significance, and I am continuing. (Commotion in the hall, applause).

Nationality problems. We inherited from Stalinism a national constitutional structure that bears the imprint of imperial thinking and the imperial policy of "divide and conquer." The victims of this legacy are the small union republics and the small national formations that belong to the union republics according to the principle of administrative subordination. They have been subjected to national oppression over the course of decades. Now these problems have dramatically burst out onto the surface.

But the large people, including the Russian people, who have borne the principal burden of imperial ambitions and the consequences of adventurism and dogmatism in foreign and domestic policy, have also been a victim of this legacy. Urgent measures are needed. I propose discussion of a transition to a federal, horizontal system of national constitutional structure. This system provides for granting all the existing national territorial formations, regardless of their size and present status, equal political, legal, and economic rights, with the preservation of present borders. In time, it may be necessary to adjust the borders.

M.S. Gorbachev: Anyway, finish up, Andrey Dmitriyevich. You've used two time allotments already, two allotments.

A.D. Sakharov: I'm finishing. I am omitting arguments. I have left out a great deal.

M.S. Gorbachev: That's all. Your time, two time allotments, has run out. I beg your pardon. That is all.

A.D. Sakharov: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: That's all, Comrade Sakharov. Do you respect the congress? Good. That's all.

A.D. Sakharov: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: All!

A.D. Sakharov: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: I ask you to finish. I ask you to conclude. That's all! Take away your speech, please! (Applause). I ask you to sit down. Turn on the third microphone.

Voice from the floor: (Inaudible)

M.S. Gorbachev: What do you want?

A.Ya. Troitskiy, head of an office at the Kalinin Oblast Institute for Advanced Teacher Training, RSFSR (from

the All-Union Organization of War and Labor Veterans): I want to express some surprise over the fact that the Presidium is for some reason dividing us, people's deputies with equal rights. Some have been able to speak seven or eight times each. Why should we listen to Comrade Sakharov now? Why is he permitted to address the people of the Soviet Union from the rostrum of this congress? Isn't he assuming too much? (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: We are continuing the congress's work. Permit me to ask USSR People's Deputy Valentina Adamovna Kiseleva to read the draft message of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies to the Peoples of the World, on which we have agreed.

V.A. Kiseleva, operator at the 60th Anniversary of the USSR Grodno Khimvolokno [Chemical Fiber] Production Association Grodno (Grodno National Territorial Election District, Belorussian SSR):

"Message of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies to the Peoples of the World.

"We USSR People's Deputies have gathered for our first congress in order, in a situation of glasnost and openness, to lay the legal foundation for the comprehensive democratic renewal of our socialist society. As authorized representatives of the millions-strong Soviet people, we fully recognize the historic responsibility that rests on us. We recognize that the problems that have arisen before our homeland today are immense, and we proceed on the premise that there is no alternative to the radical restructuring of all spheres of our life. We have chosen this path thoughtfully and firmly, and we will not depart from it.

"In the center of our attention is the human being with his joys, sadness, cares and hopes. We are convinced that a socialist society does not and cannot have any moral alternative to the interests of the people and the aspirations and rights of the free human being.

"Restructuring is the internal affair of the peoples of the Soviet Union; it has been born of our country's urgent needs. But we do not separate ourselves from the world community and from the processes that are determining the face of present-day civilization, and we take freedom of the individual, democracy, and social justice as fundamental values on which the life of our society should be built.

"We regard restructuring as part of the democratization of the entire world order that is gathering force, as the Soviet Union's contribution to solving the global problems that are hanging over humanity. They are all closely interconnected, interwoven into a dangerous and tight knot. It can and must be untangled, but that requires that the world community concert its efforts in the name of its survival.

"Restructuring is fundamentally changing our attitude toward the surrounding world. Today we are open to the world and prepared to cooperate with everyone for whom human life and dignity are the supreme values, and we count on mutual understanding

"In the presently rapidly changing world, it is impossible to live according to old rules and standards. One cannot count on strengthening one's own security and providing for one's own well-being while disregarding the interests of others. It is senseless to turn international relations into an arena of ideological wars. It is criminal to exhaust the world economy with an arms race and to shun concern for preserving the human environment. No matter what barriers separate us, we are all children of mother earth, and we have one common destiny. Therefore, we call for an end to hostility and discord among peoples. A new peaceful period in the history of humanity is possible, and this possibility must be turned into reality.

"The congress solemnly assures the planet's peoples that it assumes responsibility for the Soviet state's strict observance of the principles of peaceful coexistence with regard to all the earth's states and peoples.

"On the basis of the new political thinking, the USSR Congress of People's Deputies has affirmed the principles by which our state should be guided in international affairs. They come down to the following:

"—the security of our country must be ensured, first and foremost, by political means, as a constituent element of universal and equal security in the process of the demilitarization, democratization, and humanization of international relations, relying on the authority and capabilities of the United Nations;

"—nuclear weapons should be eliminated as the result of negotiations oriented toward disarmament and the reduction of a state's defense potential to the limits of reasonable sufficiency;

"—the use of force and threat of the use of force for the purposes of attaining any political, economic, or other goals are intolerable; in relations with other countries, respect for sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity are mandatory;

"—not confrontation, but dialogue and negotiations with an orientation toward a balance of interests should become the sole means of solving international problems and settling conflicts;

"—the Soviet economy should be organically included in the world economy on the basis of mutual advantage and equality, and should actively participate in the development and observance of the rules of the present-day international division of labor, scientific, and technological exchange, and trade.

"Our congress, as the supreme body of state authority, declares: the Soviet Union intends to strictly adhere to these principles in its foreign policy. Such is our foreign-policy strategy henceforth and forever. Such is the open and honest line of the Soviet Union and restructuring in the world arena. Such is the choice of the Soviet people.

"We appeal to the world's peoples and to world public opinion to develop the exchange of ideas and people, cultural and spiritual values, contacts, and dialogue in every way possible, at all levels and in all spheres, and to work together to seek and find mutually acceptable compromises for the sake of preserving peace on earth, for the sake of the prosperity and progress of all humanity." (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: That can be discussed. What do you think, comrades? If anyone has any clarifications or improvements, a request to approach the Presidium, in order that you can present your proposals. In principle I can put the question of adopting the draft message that has been read to a vote. Whoever is in favor of adopting the draft, I ask you to raise your documents. I ask you to lower them. Opposed? Abstentions? Two people. It is adopted. (Applause).

Dear comrades, the congress is concluding; this is the 13th day of its work. I once again want to thank you, the USSR People's Deputies, for the tremendous contribution that you have made to its preparation and conduct. We have all agreed on this, and in this case I reject Deputy Sakharov's negative opinions aimed at disparaging the congress and disparaging its role and landmark significance in our country's destiny. (Applause). Nonetheless, I welcome the open, direct discussion that has taken place here, for perhaps the first time in our entire history, of all the problems that trouble our people and the peoples of the world. (Applause). Quite likely we, as the first congress, have, as it was foreseen, been unable to exhaust all the problems. Therefore, many of us have remained outside the boundaries of the congress. But after all, we are just beginning our work. After the congress, on the basis of its instructions and the decisions it has adopted, the USSR Supreme Soviet will begin its work as a standing body, a legislative body, and its committees and its immense number of deputies will begin their work. This is opening up a great opportunity for the ideas that have been heard here and the proposals that have been submitted here to receive the most thorough and attentive consideration and embodiment in legislative acts or in the activities of the executive authority, or to be discussed at subsequent stages of the activity of the congress, the Supreme Soviet, and the bodies that they create.

I am extremely satisfied with the fact that, thanks to openness and pluralism of opinions, we for the first time have come to sense all the problems that characterize our society's present state. And perhaps for the first time we are recognizing, at this congress, the immensity, importance, and scale of the tasks that will need to be accomplished by the new bodies of Soviet power that have been created now at the top echelon, and that will be created on the basis of the new approaches and under the conditions of openness, democracy, and glasnost at the next stage of the political reform. We are armed with better knowledge. This gives us the hope and confidence that we will make the right decisions and better act to resolutely advance restructuring in all areas, especially in those sectors whose activity is connected with the satisfaction of our peoples' urgent needs and requirements. We are certain that all the basic ideas expressed here, including those that are debatable, will find their resolution in the further activities of the bodies of Soviet power.

Allow me, comrade deputies, to wish you great successes. We have tremendous work ahead of us. And we are confident that this corps of deputies will be up to the business that we have begun with regard to the renewal of our society in the interests of the people, on the basis of the principles of democracy and glasnost, and in the interests of our people's life. I wish you great successes.

The agenda is finished. The first USSR Congress of People's Deputies is declared closed. (Applause).

The national anthem of the Soviet Union is played.